

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



101 750

UNIVERSA
LIBRARY

Intercollegiate Debates

(Volume VII)

A YEAR BOOK OF COLLEGE DEBATING
WITH RECORDS OF QUESTIONS AND DECISIONS,
SPECIMEN SPEECHES AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

HARVARD — PRINCETON — YALE — SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE —
KANSAS WESLEYAN COLLEGE — MORNINGSIDES COLLEGE — ST.
OLAF COLLEGE — SOUTH DAKOTA WESLEYAN — KANSAS STATE
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE — KANSAS STATE NORMAL — YANK-
TON COLLEGE — HURON COLLEGE — UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH-
ERN CALIFORNIA LAW SCHOOL — COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

EDITED BY

EGBERT RAY NICHOLS

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS

HINDS, HAYDEN & ELDREDGE, INC., PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK PHILADELPHIA CHICAGO

Copyright, 1917, by
HINDS, HAYDEN & ELDREDGE, Inc.
U S A

PREFACE

This year Intercollegiate Debates carries some extremely interesting debates. Perhaps no volume in the series is more fortunate in the caliber of its debates or the wide range of interest in its subjects. For instance this volume has two debates dealing with different phases of the question of the Military Preparedness of the United States. One of these debates is from the triangular of America's three foremost universities—Harvard, Yale, Princeton. The other is notable because it is a debate between a large Eastern university and a large Western university and represents an ocean to ocean debate trip. The great problem confronting our country in the Orient is discussed. Socialism in control of our means of production and exchange is debated pro and con. The eternal problem of municipal government is discussed in its latest developments. Labor Unions bob up again for a debate on another angle of the many possible questions this perplexing movement offers.

For these many interesting and capable discussions the editor wishes to express his gratitude to the young men who wrote them and to the instructors and professors of English, Economics and Public Speaking who aided in collecting them for the present volume.

Another new feature is added this year to the Appen-

PREFACE

dices or Debating Year Book of the volume, namely, a Summary of the Debate Record in each volume up to and including the present one and comprising the years 1910-1916. The compilation of this new Appendix has occasioned a great deal of extra work but that it will be appreciated by the debating world is certain and that is reward enough for the extra labor in compilation.

EGBERT RAY NICHOLS.

University of Redlands,
Redlands, California,
February, 1917.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
I. THE SWISS SYSTEM OF COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE.	
A. Princeton vs. Harvard	3
B. Princeton vs. Yale	18
C. Bibliography, Compulsory Military Training and Service	36
II. EXEMPTION OF LABOR UNIONS FROM ANTI-TRUST LEGISLATION.	
A. Southwestern College (Kansas) vs. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	47
B. Southwestern College vs. Kansas Wesleyan University	77
C. Southwestern Bibliography	106
III. CITY MANAGER PLAN OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.	
A. South Dakota Wesleyan vs. Morningside College	111
B. St. Olaf College vs. Morningside College	134
C. South Dakota Wesleyan vs. St. Olaf College	159
D. Morningside College vs. South Dakota Wesleyan	182
E. Morningside Bibliography of the City Manager Plan	204
IV. OPEN DOOR POLICY IN CHINA.	
A. Kansas State Agricultural College vs. Kansas State Normal (Dual)	211
B. Bibliography on the Open Door Policy	265
V. SOCIALISTIC CONTROL OF PRODUCTION AND EXCHANGE.	
A. Yankton College vs. South Dakota Wesleyan	271
B. Huron College vs. Yankton College	304
C. Yankton College Bibliography	331
VI. INCREASE IN ARMY AND NAVY.	
A. University of Southern California Law School vs. Columbia University	341

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
VII. GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS.	
A. Southwestern College vs. University of Red-lands	389
B. Bibliography, Government Ownership of Inter-state Railroads	444
APPENDIX I	
1915-1916 Year Book of Intercollegiate Debating . . .	449
APPENDIX II	
Record of Debate Questions, 1915-1916	505
APPENDIX III	
Summary of Annual Debate Records, 1910-1916 . . .	515
INDEX TO THIS VOLUME	619
GENERAL INDEX, VOLUMES I TO VII INCLUSIVE	625

•

THE SWISS SYSTEM OF COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

•

THE SWISS MILITARY SYSTEM

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY vs. HARVARD AND YALE UNIVERSITIES

The Harvard, Princeton, Yale triangular held its annual debates on March 24th., 1916. The subject under discussion this year was the Swiss System of Military training and service and its applicability to the United States. Princeton University won the meet by unanimous decisions on both sides of the question. The Harvard affirmative defeated the Yale negative in the third debate, also by a unanimous decision.

The Harvard negative used the interesting strategy discussed in the Introduction of Intercollegiate Debates Volume IV as the "Sneak lead." The debaters accepted the case established by the Princeton affirmative for compulsory military service and sought to show that the French system would be a better system to adopt than the Swiss system. This dodging of the negative of compulsory service failed to win for them. In debates with the University of New Mexico and Southwestern College (Kansas) on Government Ownership of Interstate Railroads the University of Redlands used this same strategy, accepting the principle of government ownership but declaring for ownership of all the railroads rather than merely the interstate railroads. The debaters made the case strong enough to defeat New Mexico but lost to Southwestern.

The Princeton winning speeches are given in the following pages. The Princeton speeches are more in the line of the expected in a negative of this proposition and make clever use of dilemma.

The Princeton speeches were contributed by Professor H. F. Covington of the Department of Public Speaking, Princeton University.

The exact statement of the question was: Resolved, that the United States should adopt a system of compulsory military service modelled after that of Switzerland.

THE SWISS SYSTEM OF COM- PULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY vs. HARVARD

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, J. C. TAYLOR, PRINCETON, '18

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are advocating a system of compulsory military service. Two years ago such a question would not have been debatable, for we would then have had to show that we need some plan for adequate defense; but to-day in view of the war in Europe American minds have become so aroused to the need of being prepared, that the only remaining question is: "How shall we prepare?"

We are proposing a system in consonance with our historic military attitude: a large navy, a small standing army to man our coast defenses and afford professional artillerymen, and a citizen reserve; but that citizen reserve must be efficiently trained and organized. In looking about us for a system applicable to our needs, we very naturally turn to Switzerland, like us a democracy. In Switzerland the boys are from an early age given drills and gymnastic training in the schools in order to make them strong and active; at the age of 20 the boy

receives his first real military training and at that time he serves for a period of from two to three months with the colors, and during the following two years and every alternate year until he is 32 he serves for a period of two weeks. This body of men from the ages of 20 to 32 form the first line reserve, the second being formed by those men from the ages of 32 to 48. Under this system the officers are men who have risen from the ranks and have further equipped themselves in a military school provided and controlled by the government. This in brief is the Swiss system and if the gentlemen of the negative would oppose such a system they must either admit that we can have no means of adequate defense or advance some other system; and any other system, regardless of how they may guise it by technicality, is based fundamentally upon the volunteer system, and before such can be a success the gentlemen must give us some proof that we can get the men, a thing which so far we have never been able to do.

But we must realize that any system will be in use twenty years in time of peace to every year it is in use in time of war; and therefore before we show that this system will suit the needs of our nation, and before we show that it is the only system which will meet our needs in time of war and connect protection with economy we must show that it is fundamentally democratic and especially suited to our needs, because it will assist us in meeting certain definite problems which are confronting the American people to-day.

We have been admitting to our shores for years thou-

sands of foreigners, many of whom live here surrounded by a foreign environment, speaking their native tongues, having their patriotism to a foreign land kept aroused by foreign literature, and living under conditions which are by no means in accordance with American standards of living. Then aside from these there is that class which are not foreign Americans but foreigners in America. Why is all this? It is largely due to the fact that we Americans have not taken upon ourselves the task of teaching these people how they should live. What we need is some strong national centralizing force to bind these people together, a system that more than this gives them American standards. Under a Swiss system such as we propose these foreign men would, at an age when they are most susceptible to outside influences, be taken into a training camp along with the youth of America. By the sanitation of the camp we would teach them the laws of hygienic living and how to prevent disease; by the drill work and the training we would build up for each one a stronger body and awaken an obedience to command and a trait of discipline; we would by association give them an idea of what the American citizen ought to be like; but most of all we would show them that we have a government that extends beyond city halls and that this government is not a meal ticket upon which to get rich or fat, but a mighty master to be served. If we can do this, we awaken a meaning in the minds of these people as to what our nation stands for; if we can give to each one of these people a stronger body and a more manly carriage and physique and on top of this

teach them how to live, we have made a great advance in the assimilation of the foreign element.

But indeed the hyphenated Americans, as we see fit to call these people, are not the only ones to whom the hyphen may be adapted. Even among our natural Americans there is a lack of the appreciation of what an American citizen should be like. The social cliques of our country still continue to undermine American social liberty while the friction between capital and labor still continues to stagnate the business world.

Take for an example one of our large cities. Part of the young men are gathered around the University Club, part around the Y. M. C. A., part around an athletic club, and so I might enumerate. Now these boys later in life fuse together and form a clique in their respective cities. Americans, in short, have nothing in common. Again what we need is some strong unifying force to draw us together. If we can take rich and poor, high and low, and place them side by side in a training camp, if we can make them meet on some common ground in a common duty and service, are we not year after year going to bring all classes a little nearer together and in the end mould out of our nation not a group of orders but one great strong national American order? Look at capital and labor. Labor is either so uneducated that they cannot see, or too busy keeping body and soul together to see the status of life as it is lived by the laboring man, while the capitalist is too self-possessed and too self-centered to see the other side of life. The friction between the two is one great mistake. Under a Swiss

system we would bring the representatives of these two great classes together, side by side at that same susceptible age. Now, year after year would we not by this association give the capitalist's son some idea of democracy and of the other fellow's feelings, and would not this increase generation after generation? And on the other hand, would not the laborer be aroused to the advantages of an education and the advantages of a higher form of living? Now if we can do this, bring capital down to a democratic standing and draw them a little nearer to the laboring man and at the same time bring the laboring man a little nearer to the capitalist, we are going to narrow that gulf year after year and in the end do away with it entirely.

But what effect would this system have upon our citizens? Think of what a military training would do to all our young men. They would become physically stronger year after year and generation after generation. They would become alive to the idea of service and have awakened in them a keener appreciation of what our nation is. Any nation cannot be stronger or better than the average citizen. But a citizen who is strong renders the most service to his country, his home, his community, and his God. Those who are not strong are the weaklings, the sluggards, the criminals, etc. I do not speak of bodily strength alone. Let us remove American youths as far as possible from this case.

But men cry of the patriotism of the volunteer system, saying how much more manly it is to volunteer. Yes, this is true, but we must not forget that volunteering

means the giving up of many years out of the cream of a man's life at a time when a young man is beginning life's duties. While he is justly serving his country the man who lives next door is gaining a lead in business which the other cannot hope to overcome easily. Would you have American patriotism carry with it a mill-stone? But think of the advantages to our industry and business if all the young men are stronger and more obedient to command, and have a keener appreciation of the power of application. The Swiss leaders say that the engineering projects of the Alps have been carried out because the Swiss system has given their young men a power of efficiency of which they never dreamed. Could we not make use of some more efficiency and individual power in our land? In brief, let us Americanize hyphenated Americans, but let us first Americanize ourselves.

A compulsory system is not impossible in a government possessing free institutions. A free government is not the one that possesses the least number of laws or the one that has no laws at all, but the one that offers equal opportunity and results in the greatest general good. Now if we can by this system take the foreigners and make them more desirable citizens by teaching them how to live as they should, by making them real Americans, do we not give them a little nearer an equal opportunity and give ourselves a more pleasant land, which in the end results in the greatest general good? And if we can in the end fuse capital and labor, are we not offering a little nearer equal opportunity and a greater general good? And if we can mould our people together and

develop a stronger race physically and mentally, are we not bringing about this same principle of opportunity and results? In short, this system grants to every man his privileges, but exacts from every man his duty. It will awaken a keener appreciation of the responsibilities of American citizenship. It will Americanize hyphenated Americans but will also Americanize ourselves. It is a system that is fundamentally democratic because it offers equal opportunity and results in the greatest general good. Ladies and gentlemen, that is democracy, a preparation for peace, the prime essential of a peaceful nation.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, C. F. MARTIN, PRINCETON, '16

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The proposal that our nation should adopt a system of compulsory military service is based on our need for a definite national military system. Our nation has the distinction of being the only one of the world's powers which has no national system. As a group of forty-eight allied states we have a sort of chaotic military reserve, as a nation we have nothing. The growing importance of our national policies, the enormous increase in our world commerce, our position as one of the world's greatest nations—all these make our present military situation anomalous. If we are to be a national force we must first be a *force*; we must show the world that we have the strength to enforce our convictions. When the world knows that, our nation will be secure. Preparedness for military defense is the best preparation for peace.

We are the greatest democracy in the world. Our military system must therefore be democratic in every sense of the word. It must recognize the fundamental duty of every citizen of a democracy to defend his nation. As my colleague has shown, a system of compulsory service modelled after that of Switzerland does recognize that principle. Moreover, such a system will give us those positive social and economic benefits which are as important in time of peace as is adequate preparedness in time of war. For every year of war we shall have twenty-five years of peace; we must therefore have a military system which is useful in time of peace as well as in time of war. The proposed system is such a system. It affords the maximum of military protection while establishing the security of our democracy.

We come, then, to the protection afforded by the proposed system: is it adequate? If we follow the general lines of the Swiss system we shall have a force of about eleven million organized citizen reserves, about five millions of whom will be a first-line reserve to be called out when danger threatens. It will be a national force of citizen reserves, organized for instant mobilization, trained in the essentials of warfare. Instead of the present chaos there will be centralized responsibility; in place of the present raw recruits there will be men efficiently trained in all the essentials of military practice; an efficient *national militia*, not a standing army of professional soldiers. We do not need or want such a standing army, but we do need and want a big national citizen reserve which can be mobilized at any point at any time.

We are proud of the fact that our system provides a large reserve force. We are proud because we are proud of the magnitude of our country, of her enormous wealth and resources. It is idle to speak of our national defense in terms of thousands when we have three millions of square miles of area, one hundred millions of population, and two hundred billions of resources. California is three times as large as England; all Germany could be put in Wyoming and Colorado. We have ten thousand miles of boundary, vulnerable at almost every point. Does the negative hope to protect such a country with a few hundred thousand men?

Modern wars are fought in terms of millions, and nations employ not only one army but several armies; we must face these conditions. How does the negative expect to defend both Boston and San Francisco against invading armies? And yet it is quite possible that both shores will be attacked by a powerful alliance. How would they protect both the Canadian and the Mexican borders, or either alone, with a few hundred thousand soldiers? Your army must be either concentrated or scattered; if concentrated, what enemy would be so foolish as to attack at the point of concentration? If scattered, what sort of resistant force could it give at the point of attack? We must face the issue squarely; half-way measures will not do. Modern wars are fought on a large scale; our protection must also be on a large scale. Such protection will be much more than preparedness for war; it will be the best possible preparation for peace; but half-way preparedness will neither

discourage attack nor meet the attack when it comes.

We said that our system will provide eleven millions of organized citizen reserves ready for instant mobilization. That is its first big advantage: it will provide sufficient men at the right place at any time. But it has another advantage: in place of the raw volunteer recruits upon which we must now rely we shall have citizens who are trained as well as patriotic. Every citizen who is physically fit will get at least one hundred and fifty days of intensive training in a training camp,—about seventy days at the age of twenty and the rest in seven annual periods. This intensive training will give him all the essentials of military methods and military discipline. He will know how to shoot straight and how to dig trenches, and, most important, the necessity for obedience to orders, that obedience which will make him a better citizen as well as a good soldier. So our force of national citizen reserves will be more than efficiently organized for instant mobilization; it will know how to fight when it is mobilized. That is adequate preparedness and the maximum of protection for our nation.

This system is distinctly anti-militaristic, because it teaches men the meaning of war. In place of the flashy, screaming eagle patriotism which does more harm than good, it creates a sober, dignified patriotism, a patriotism which will know when the cry of war should not be raised, because it will know what it must do when that cry is raised. One hundred and fifty days of hard work in a training camp will cure any man of a desire to go to war.

We come, then, to the question of cost: can we afford to pay the premium on this safe insurance? Is this maximum protection too costly? We should not say exactly what the system will cost; but we are sure we are making a high estimate when we say one hundred and fifty millions. We say that because we know that last year the people of the United States paid one thousand dollars for every soldier in its army. We also know that one-half of that was for wages, which are eliminated in the Swiss system. It is therefore reasonable to say that every one of the two hundred thousand men constantly in training under our system will cost not more than five hundred dollars per year, a total of one hundred million dollars. We add a high estimate of fifteen millions for transportation, and twenty millions for equipment, and call the total one hundred and fifty millions. Is that too much for an organized and trained force of eleven million men? A tax of one dollar and fifty cents per year on every inhabitant for the protection of his home and business! Is that burdensome? An insurance premium of less than one tenth of one per cent. on our two hundred billions of resources! Is that more than they are worth? That is what we mean by maximum protection, protection at minimum cost.

If the negative doubts the reasonableness of this cost, let them show how they can get equal value for less money. Can they show that we can get any adequate protection at any price under any other system? Any other must be based on volunteer service: can they guarantee a sufficient number of volunteers?

We stand for compulsory military service because it makes adequate protection certain. As long as we have national policies, as long as we have priceless resources, as long as we have almost limitless acres of fertile land within our borders, peopled by one hundred millions of American citizens, as long as we hope to protect all these and to hold for them a place in the sun, so long it is criminal to play with half-way measures. Our nation deserves and needs the greatest protection we can provide. We propose to furnish that maximum of protection, and at a minimum of cost.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, WALTER HAYNES JOHNSON,
PRINCETON, '17

Ladies and Gentlemen: Certainty of action has great advantages. When a nation is certain of its policy and its security, its business runs more smoothly, its government is steadier, and its foreign affairs are less complicated. Should the Swiss system of compulsory military service be adopted here, we, the American people, would know that in time of peace our democracy was preserved, and that in time of war that democracy was secure.

This combination of security and democracy can be found together in no other scheme of defence. Any other plan, no matter what its title, no matter how Utopian it may appear, no matter how it is disguised by technicalities, if it is based upon volunteer service, is both unsound in theory and impractical of execution.

In theory it is most unjust. It places the responsibility

of our defence upon the shoulders of a few men, and upon them alone. The brave men go, but the cowards, the shirkers, and the money-getters may remain at home in a security bought by the lives of better men. The men who go are the leaders, and they go from the railroads, the factories, the banks. Many of them could far better serve their country by remaining right at their respective businesses, especially in these days when the economic resources, and their proper management, mean so much in war time.

The statement that a volunteer system is unreliable may be considered from two aspects. The men who do go are untrained raw recruits, "canonenfetter," as the Germans say. The good men go first, and with them volunteering stops. It did in the Revolution, it did in the Civil War, it did in the Spanish-American War. In the Civil War draft had to be resorted to, armed draft at that, with its attendant evils of bounty and purchase of substitutes. In England to-day, when she is fighting for her very life, when her very existence might be determined by the toss of a coin, the men do not volunteer. This reliance upon volunteer service has proved an utter failure.

But it is claimed the volunteer theory has not been given a fair trial. What we should try is a system of voluntary training in time of peace. That is beautiful, but it is laughable. The men will not train in time of peace, of their own accord. With every inducement afforded them of magnificent armories, to drill, dance, and hold athletic events in, our National Guard is but

seventy per cent. recruited. And of the men who do belong, about forty per cent. go to camp, and about fifty-five per cent. take the required rifle practice. When we consider our regular army the situation is the same. The regiments, batteries, and companies on the Mexican border to-day are but skeleton organizations. We have just asked for 20,000 men, but if they do not respond faster than they have in the last week, according to the recruiting office in Chicago, it will take six months to get that many. According to Adjutant General McCain, who has charge of all the recruiting, this cannot be remedied by shortening the term of service. We might of course do it by going into the common labor market and bidding for labor, if we bid high enough, but that is not feasible.

Ladies and gentlemen, under various conditions, the volunteer principle, as applied in various systems, has never worked. Why then, oh why, should we continue to dicker with makeshifts, temporary expedients, half-way measures, and pink pill remedies, based on such a principle! It won't produce the men. Secretary of War Garrison declares that it is for Congress to decide between inadequate security, and compulsion. These are the only alternatives, and in the light of reason, therefore, we should follow the safe course.

While wars are terrible, they do occur. We wish we were living in a world where there was no war and bloodshed. But we are not living in such a world. We wish we were living in a world where there was an Augustine peace. But we are not living in such a world. We are living in an essentially practical world, and sane cogni-

zance of that fact means that we seriously consider the conditions in the world to-day. Preparedness is a preventive of war in a democracy. Nine-tenths of wisdom consists of being wise in time. To those who may claim that such action on our part might prevent world peace, we would answer that we can't be a force for good in the world unless we are a force.

The European nations will not come forth bled white. They will have their great navies. They will have their immense armies of trained veterans, led by officers skilled in the art of modern warfare. On the other hand we are prosperous, with a prosperity gained from their misfortune, but honestly gained. It must be protected. The war's heritage to Europe is a desire to recoup economically and financially. We haven't a friend in the world, unless perhaps Belgium and China. England believes we have been squeezing blood-money from her, in asking \$1,000 for machine guns which do not cost \$95 to make. France thinks we should have backed her up, as she did us in the Revolution. And as for Germany, you know her sentiment. She has a motto, that God, and God alone, protects drunkards, little children, and the United States. The time may not be far off when we are the exception which proves the rule. And as for Japan, she has been making money hand over fist from Russia. She has completed her acquisition of all the strategic points on the western Pacific. She has gained from Mexico exclusive fishing rights in Magdalena Bay, and has there built accommodations for 30,000 — fishermen!

This is the situation; these are the facts. What shall we do?

We admire, but do not commend, the dogged persistency with which the negative cling to a plan of defence based upon a volunteer system, which has never worked.

We believe in preparation, preparation for peace, preparation against war. Because of our great size, this necessitates the ability to have millions of trained men when war breaks out. Therefore, we advocate universal compulsory service as a way to obtain maximum security at minimum cost in money and ideals. We do not ask as a favor, but challenge as a right to the United States, the support of all men physically fit.

The essential requisite of any defence measure, namely, that it is democratic, is fulfilled in such service. It is for the greatest good of the greatest number, with equal responsibility for all men. It is the *only* defence which will not hazard our security or sacrifice our democracy.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY vs. YALE UNIVERSITY

FIRST NEGATIVE, B. B. ATTERBURY, PRINCETON, '16

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The history of public opinion in a democracy is a succession of extremes, and nowhere has this been more evident than in our military affairs. Two years ago we disregarded even the reasonable demands of our naval and military experts. To-day we go to the opposite extreme, an extreme more dangerous than our former under-prepared-

ness. During these two years we have watched the European struggle, and the horror of it has grown upon us, has affected our judgment. No longer is it easy for us to consider a military question in the necessary calm and reasonable way. The natural result has been a horde of wild militaristic suggestions, one of the most radical of which is the proposition we are discussing. We believe most heartily that our country should have adequate protection, but we do not see the necessity of going into hysterics on the subject. We demand protection which is adequate without being extravagantly superfluous; there is no reason why we should force upon one of the great nations of the world a burdensome system which has been found necessary in one of the smallest. We demand protection which is not only adequate, but adapted to our peculiar needs; we wish not to import an alien Swiss system of national defence, but to develop a native American system.

The advocates of the Swiss system, therefore, must prove that the sacrifice it involves is necessary, that in return for this sacrifice we obtain the type of defence best suited to our needs, and that the system may be adopted without violence to American democratic ideals.

In standing for the Swiss system of universal compulsory service, its advocates support a step which would compel every able-bodied citizen of the United States, no matter how great the inconvenience to himself or to those dependent upon him, to undergo military training for a first period of two months and successive annual periods of about two weeks. In Switzerland a sacrifice

of this magnitude is absolutely necessary, in the United States it is not; and yet unless the supporters of the system can prove this necessity their case must fail. Consider the position of Switzerland, one of the smallest of sovereign states, with an area of about fifteen thousand square miles—just twice the size of this state of New Jersey;—with a population less than that of our single city of New York. Switzerland's largest city is but half again the size of our neighboring metropolis of Trenton. She is, moreover, surrounded by four warlike and powerful neighbors, France, Germany, Austria, and Italy, with a combined war strength of over eighteen millions. Her one hope of safety lies in her ability to exact so high a price for invasion as to make this step unprofitable. To this end every man upon whom she can lay her hand by universal conscription is none too many for her need. In the United States just the opposite is the case. We are a powerful state with thirty times the population of Switzerland. Instead of being surrounded by dangerous rivals, we are supreme upon two continents. It is absurd to suppose that a people so blessed by fortune in strength and location should be forced to make sacrifices in proportion to those necessary in a tiny state whose situation is as unfavorable as ours is favorable.

But further, the sponsors of this system cannot show that in return for this sacrifice we shall obtain the type of defence we need. You will notice that the Swiss plan with its absurdly short term of training is essentially a militia scheme, and from the past history of our nation

we have learned the extravagance in men and money due to reliance upon half-trained militia. The essential feature of the Swiss system, the one which distinguishes it from all other plans, is the fact that it cannot include a regular army. This is made plain by an express provision in the thirteenth article of the first division of the Swiss Constitution. In Switzerland a standing army is not needed. With a small territory and few troops maneuver tactics can be quickly taught. Most important of all, the country is so rugged that regular troops have but slight advantage over irregular. The Swiss hope of safety lies in a long and desperate guerrilla warfare. Just the reverse is true in this country. Indeed, as is pointed out by General Macomb, President of the Army War College:

“We cannot adopt the Swiss system in our country. . . . Such a force as they are developing would not be effective for our purposes. It does not give sufficient training.” We are practically an insular state, separated from possible enemies by three thousand miles of open sea. Danger could appear only in the form of an expeditionary force of at the outside—according to the report of the Army War College—four hundred thousand men. What we need, therefore, is first, a powerful navy; second, in case they should elude our navy, an efficient regular army ready upon the instant to crush the invaders before they could secure a foothold. We have learned from the European war how difficult it is to dislodge a foe when once he has had time to intrench himself. Two points in particular must be borne in

mind: the comparatively level nature of our seaboard gives regular troops an enormous advantage over militia; we must have a standing force continuously ready to defend New York and our munition plants, all of which are located within a short distance of this heart of our country. A sudden blow at this vital and exposed organ might well prove fatal. It is impossible for us, therefore, to consider a system which does not allow a regular mobile army. In fact, with conditions in the two countries so diametrically reversed, we might just as well advocate the American plan for the Swiss navy, as the Swiss plan for the American army. We do not need a militia force, which attempts to remedy by unnecessary numbers its deficiency in training, but an efficient regular army of about 150,000, with twice that number of reserves, backed by a body of some 500,000 thoroughly trained volunteers under Federal supervision. This is a natural, effective American system.

And now finally the supporters of any compulsory system must justify their violation of our democratic ideals. They cannot mention an instance in all history when a democratic people has submitted to compulsory service save under the spur of direst necessity. Switzerland, as we have seen, has this spur. France has watched Germany glaring at her across her border. Never except under press of circumstances like these has a democracy turned to the last resort of compulsory service. There is not a man in America who does not feel an instinctive repugnance to the very idea of conscription. Patriotism that is compelled is not democratic patriotism. If we

are to make sacrifices for our country—and where is the American who would not welcome the chance to make them?—we must be permitted to do so of our own free will, else we are robbed of the greatest pleasure in our act. And, what is more important, unless they are voluntary it is difficult for us to put our hearts into them and to make them effective. Compulsory service in a democracy violates the fundamental principle of democratic liberty. Its violation can be justified only upon grounds of the most absolute necessity.

And now in conclusion—if we find this sacrifice of money and ideals, of concrete wealth and abstract principle, absolutely necessary, if we could imagine the United States in so desperate a position as to demand compulsory service, we would still oppose the Swiss system. Its term of training is so short as to secure none of the possible benefits of conscription, whether from the standpoint of democracy or efficiency. We would demand a training period long enough to promise us in return for our sacrifices the absolute security our nation must have. The Swiss system is a half-hearted compromise which would force upon us the evils of conscription without its virtues. Its advocates must prove its superiority over both a natural American system and a compulsory system with an efficient training period.

SECOND NEGATIVE, WILLIAM BIXLER BARNITZ,
PRINCETON, '17

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first speaker has taken up the unsuitableness of the Swiss

system of military service to the United States; he has pointed out how it is unsuited to our geographical situation and inharmonious with our democratic institutions. These are matters of vital importance and must be carefully considered by the affirmative. I will now consider some effects such a system would have here if we were to adopt it, speaking in some detail of the extravagance it would mean in men and money, as well as of the danger involved in adopting it at this time.

At the time of the 1910 Census there were about 20,500,000 men in the United States between the ages of 20 and 48, that is, those ages between which a man in Switzerland is liable for military service. Since that time our total population has increased about 7,000,000, so that the total number of men in the United States to-day between the ages of 20 and 48 is about 22,000,000. Under the Swiss system about half this number, that is about 11,000,000 men, would be trained and liable for service. I do not mean they would be efficiently trained soldiers; instead they are men who have received a little training and need six months more to be completely ready for war. But the numbers are the astonishing thing — 11,000,000 trained men in the United States! Do you fully grasp the enormity of these figures? Can you conjure up even in the wildest flight of your imagination a situation in which we would need such a force? Do we contemplate conquering the world? A force this size would be larger than the combined total trained strength of both Germany and Russia at the outbreak of the present war. New York State alone would have a

force more than two-thirds the size of the war strength of Japan. Illinois, eight hundred miles from any coast, would have a force of 700,000 trained men. We realize, of course, that these men would not constitute a regular standing army and would not, therefore, have all the harmful effects such a force would have, but there are certain evil effects that would result and I will consider them now.

Primarily, such a force is a large superfluity of trained men. And this superfluity is pure extravagance, for it costs money to train a man to be a soldier; and it costs the man the one thing in America which is more valuable than money — his time. It is impossible accurately to estimate the tremendous economic loss caused by taking this large number of young men out of their regular occupations, placing them in training camps for a few months at the age of twenty, when they are just bursting with enthusiasm to get out into the world and start things for themselves; and for eleven days a year for a number of years thereafter. It will not be a vacation; it will be a tremendous economic expense. The average American does not consider digging a trench under a blazing hot sun a recreation or a pleasure. And during this time these men are being supported at government expense, so that there is the double economic expense of non-production and consumption. And this is but an item in the expense of the proposed system.

But there is another item far more serious than any cost in men or money of such a system: it is the undesirable psychological effect on the nation that training

such a large number of men for war will have. The only nation in the world to-day that has been pursuing such a course long enough to see any evil effects has certainly seen them. Switzerland has had her present system only eight years; Australia only four years — not long enough in either case for any permanent evil effects to have been developed. But even at this early stage Switzerland has had to pass laws prohibiting her children from parading and “playing soldier,” such is their interest in war, aroused and incited by training the youth of the land. And in spite of the fact that we are a nation by nature un-warlike; in spite of the fact that we would be adopting this system only for defence — of course you realize that all nations start on big armament policies only for defence — in spite, in short, of our earnest desire to cling tenaciously to our traditional policy of defence, in taking this step we would be making a move which will eventually render that task more difficult. We do not maintain for an instant that in twenty-five or fifty years the United States will be a second Germany. But we do maintain that there is a well-known undesirable psychological effect produced on men by training them for war. And the affirmative cannot complacently hold that Americans would be peculiar in this respect; that we can secure all the desirable features of military training without entailing its undesirable features. They are decidedly illogical in maintaining that we would fight wars only for a righteous cause at the same time that we are the sole judge in our own case as to what is just. That principle is readily analyzable into the maxim

“might is right,” which not even the most radical of our preparedness advocates will hold.

Another consideration of prime importance is the undesirable psychological effect that such a move on our part taken at this time would have on foreign nations. Within the last few years there has sprung up a pan-Americanism which promises much for the future. How, gentlemen of the affirmative, will you justify in the eyes of those small South American republics and in the eyes of foreign nations our embarking on a large military preparation at this time? For they all realize there has been no such radical change in our situation as would warrant such a radical change in our policy. And ever suspicious, as modern nations are, they will feel that they must arm as we do. The affirmative must fully justify laying ourselves open to these suspicions, whether they do it on the grounds of immediate impending danger, which is necessity, or on the grounds of the inherent desirability of the scheme itself.

It is difficult to arrive at what would be the actual money cost of such a system in the United States. The only basis we have for a fair estimate is a comparison with Switzerland, where our model exists and has been working for some time. The military establishment of Switzerland costs almost \$9,000,000 annually. That is for a trained force of 400,000 men. A comparative estimate for the United States with the 11,000,000 trained men we would have would be \$240,000,000 annually. But there are differences between the two countries which would considerably raise this sum. For example,

transportation in Switzerland is on government-owned railroads. This would constitute an item here which does not enter into the above estimate. The boarding and lodging of troops while in training in Switzerland is done in private homes at the owner's expense. In the United States this would be both unconstitutional and impractical. The relative purchasing power of money is very much greater in Switzerland than it is here. And, finally, there would be the tremendous cost incidental to the installation of such a scheme, and to the frequent changes of equipment for such a large body of men which changed conditions and changed political parties would make necessary. In short, although we cannot accurately estimate it, every circumstance points to the fact that the system would be tremendously expensive—that it would cost us three or four or five hundred million dollars annually. But whatever the cost, even though it be but two hundred and fifty million dollars annually, it is too much to spend on any system which is not the best, which is not absolutely necessary. And until the affirmative conclusively proves that we need this system rather than any other, we cannot subject the country to the extravagance of paying such a large sum of money every year to take so many of our young men out of their regular occupations and place them in training camps just long enough to learn enough about war to become interested in it, to think about it, and to talk it over with their fellows. If our needs are similar to Switzerland's, if our geographical isolation is of no importance, if space can be annihilated and the entire French or German or

Russian or Japanese army transported to our shores in the twinkling of an eye — then let us by all means adopt compulsory service. But you know these conditions do not exist. Our situation is peculiar, and because of its peculiarity and the resulting unsuitability of the Swiss system, the adoption of it at this time, in addition to the danger it would involve and the unnecessary sacrifices it would entail, would be an unwarranted extravagance in men and money.

To conclude, I have pointed out some of the evil effects that the Swiss system would have in the United States. We would have 11,000,000 trained men, which is more than we can ever possibly need; and these men would constitute a tremendous extravagance both economically and financially. Furthermore, I have pointed out that there is a real danger involved in adopting this system at this time.

Let us not adopt universal conscription in the United States at a time when the Eastern Hemisphere is in the throes of the greatest of all wars and no man can foresee the result. But let us rather adopt a policy of moderate preparation. Let us adopt an American, not a Swiss system. And above all things let us not adopt any system which does not give us the prime thing we are after — protection. Regarding the protection this system would afford us, the third negative speaker will speak to greater length.

THIRD NEGATIVE, S. DONALD SHERRERD, PRINCETON, '18

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: You have heard the whole case of the affirmative. It was their

duty to prove to you that the Swiss system of compulsory military service is the system best suited to the United States, the one system our country should adopt. You have heard them fail in that duty. Have they shown what tremendous change has come about in our condition that we are forced to forsake sober thought and turn to so radical a proposal? Have they shown why, when we consider the problem of defense, we are to find its solution in a slavish imitation of a system used and developed by a little land-locked European state the size of Massachusetts? Have you heard any reason why we are to lay such tremendous emphasis upon that branch of our defense which is secondary in character, namely, our land forces? Have they justified by necessity their proposal to compel every normal American to let his time be confiscated by the state for this type of defense? Have they shown how it is economical to train eleven million men? Have they proved why we must expose ourselves to the dangerous national psychology which universal military training develops?

Even if they had settled these points to your satisfaction, a vital issue still lies untouched. Have they proved that under the system they propose we will at least have adequate, real defense? Will their plan, whatever its faults and exaggerations in principle and application, stand the acid test of war, and guarantee us at least safety against a possible foe? The answer, ladies and gentlemen, is emphatically "No." Upon this point I mean to dwell.

You will notice, first, that by a consistent interpreta-

tion of the question we cannot, under the Swiss plan, maintain a regular army in our country proper. We are to adopt the essentials of the Swiss system, and one of the first essentials is that the country's defense shall lie solely in the hands of militia. That is, we are to trust our defense entirely to these men who have had two months' training one year, and repetition periods of two weeks for a few years thereafter. Men so trained are to constitute the only military protection for our homes and our people. Are we then safe? What are the facts?

Our War College has again and again stated that it is impossible to develop an effective soldier in less than twelve months' intensive training. In its report dated September, 1915, the War College emphasized this conviction. In England the Royal Commission on Militia declared that efficient soldiers could not be developed in the Swiss periods. Look at France. Her one object in maintaining an army is to train real soldiers, and yet she needs two years for the job. Finally, notice that the Territorial Troops of Canada and Australia, when they were called for service in the present war, although they had already received training approximating the Swiss training, were forced to work from six to eight months longer before they could be sent to the front. Yet we are asked to trust our national existence to forces of this caliber.

Perhaps you say that the Swiss soldiers are efficient and effective. The Swiss system has never had the real test, that is, the test of war. And you will notice that

here in America we could not possibly reach even that standard of efficiency to which the Swiss have attained. Why?

First, because the people of Switzerland have centuries of military tradition behind them. A hardy race of mountaineers, they are soldiers by instinct. Everyone has heard of the famous Swiss Guard. The Swiss were forced to incorporate in the National Constitution a clause forbidding citizens to hire out for service on foreign battle-fields. Their national sport is rifle-shooting, Are we to give up the big leagues and go in for target practise?

Second, you will notice that military tactics in Switzerland are comparatively simple. There are but a few vulnerable points of attack along the frontier. Mobilization is on a small scale. The territory to be defended presents but few problems in military operations. In America we have every kind of war tactics involved. Mobilization must be on a tremendous scale. We have great coast lines to defend. The whole proposition is far more difficult than in Switzerland, and yet our people fall far short of the Swiss in capacity for the work.

Now, to attain even present standards, Switzerland has been compelled to put military training into the public schools. I do not mean gymnastics, but real military drill. It was found that the regular training periods were insufficient, and the Swiss were forced to supplement these with work in the public schools. Does anyone here this evening really propose that we shall teach the children of our lower schools the hard, cruel facts of

war? Educators stand almost unanimously against it. The National Education Association, in convention at Oakland, California, last year, strenuously opposed any such suggestion. N. C. Schaefer, State Superintendent of Education in Pennsylvania, in a speech heartily echoed throughout the country, called military instruction in the public schools nothing short of "organized insanity." Dr. Sargent, Physical Director of Harvard University, says that military drill is a poor substitute for free sport. Gymnastics we should have; military drill is wrong. And yet to approach even any standard of efficiency by the Swiss system we must make use of this pernicious method.

To sum up then, what are we asked to do? To trust our safety to millions of citizens who have but a smattering of the essentials of war. (The Swiss are not proved soldiers. And yet, even by teaching our children how to take each other's lives, we cannot hope to attain even Swiss standards.) Every authority whom we ought to trust tells us that the periods suggested are utterly inadequate. What are our needs? Will eleven million men who know something about how to shoot a gun really protect us?

If a foreign nation goes to war with the United States, that nation will not strike at random. She will attack along carefully laid plans. The blow will come hard and quick. If our navy is eluded or destroyed, in a few short weeks there will land upon our shores two or three hundred thousand of the flower of some foreign soldiery. Have you been told why we are to oppose these perfect

troops with half-trained militia? Of what use are reserves at such a time, when the pressing need is for effective men immediately available, not men who need six months' further training before taking the field? Such an invading force could cut through the very vitals of our country, and have us in such a position that millions of militia would count for absolutely nothing. Our War College says upon this point: "In case of war we need a half million trained mobile troops at the outbreak of hostilities." Every great military authority in the country stands for an efficient regular army which can meet the small but powerful attack we must expect, and keep the invading forces from strongly intrenching themselves in vital territory. And yet under the Swiss plan we are to face the perfect troops of a hostile nation with half-baked militiamen.

What plan would we of the negative favor as a means of increasing the nation's security? It is not our duty to suggest any plan,—the responsibility to construct is not ours—but we are glad to indicate the general lines of preparedness that we believe this nation should follow to achieve real results. Let us have a fine, efficient navy, second ~~to~~ to Great Britain's, and let us have strong coast defenses. Then let us maintain, under arms, a regular army of 150,000 to 200,000 men. Make the service thoroughly attractive by correcting evils of administration. Shorten the term of enlistment—a thing which should have been done generations ago—to two years with the colors and four with the reserve. Then, according to General Wood, we can graduate 75,000 men

each year from the regular army. That is, we have 150,000 men under arms at any one time, and 300,000 perfectly trained graduates of the army back in civil life but subject to immediate call. By this means we have 450,000 real soldiers to meet invasion, and not a mob of willing citizens who cannot fight effectively. Let us provide further for a volunteer citizen reserve. Have these reserves trained for war in time of peace, and trained under strict federal control. These two reforms will make a volunteer reserve thoroughly practicable and satisfactory. On the evils of state control and war-time training alone have the many criticisms of volunteers been based. Along these general lines we may achieve honest preparedness.

In a word, ladies and gentlemen, we have heard no sufficient reasons why we are to rush into any such radical proposal as the affirmative have made before us. We favor securing our defense by sane, sensible, American methods. (Why are we to imitate Switzerland when our needs are not the same?) Why is compulsory service necessary here in America? Why emphasize the wrong branch of our service? Why shatter our ideals of liberty? Why burden ourselves with expense for which we do not get adequate returns? Why spread a military spirit throughout our land? Why are we to adopt a system which involves the training of our children to arms? Why prepare our defense without reference to what our dangers really are? We of the negative believe that our country as a civilized state must be able to face the factor, war. If the affirmative could show us that we

should have compulsory service, if they could minimize its evils and dangers, then we would still ask the question, Why are we not to have compulsory service on efficient lines, with one or two years of training, like France, for instance? If we must sacrifice our ideals, our money, and our time to compulsory preparedness — which the affirmative have not proved — let us at least get in return defense that defends, and protection that protects. We do not want a mockery and a sham, which at the critical moment of terrible importance will fail in its duty, not for lack of willing citizens, but for lack of that careful training which makes willing citizens effective fighting men.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

- Militarism and the Public Schools. American City*, 13:389-90, Nov., 1915.
- Military Schools and National Defense. Outlook*, III:393-4, Oct. 20, 1915.
- Military Training in the Public Schools. Review of Reviews*, 52:577-83, Nov., 1915.
- Australasian Military System. Review of Reviews*, 52:489-90, Oct., 1915.
- Compulsory Service as a Principle of the Constitution. Nineteenth Century*, 78:808-13.
- Conscription*: a summary of the arguments for and against compulsory service. *Nation*, 101:402-3, Sept. 30, 1915.
- National Service. Nineteenth Century*, 78:792-813, Oct., 1915.
- Swiss Military System. Century*, 91:53-64, Nov., 1915.
- Armed Nation. Fortnightly*, 104:529-41, Sept., 1915.
- Enrolling the English Nation. New Republic*, 4:205-7, Sept. 25, 1915.
- Australasian Military System. World's Work*, 29:419-21, Feb., 1915.

- British Army and Compulsion.* *New Republic*, 1:13-15, Jan. 2, 1915.
- Criticism and the National Government.* *Nineteenth Century*, 78:271-9, Aug., 1915.
- National or Voluntary Service.* *Nineteenth Century*, 77:278-302, Feb., 1915.
- National Service.* *Nineteenth Century*, 78:75-85, July, 1915.
- Voluntary or Compulsory Service.* *Nineteenth Century*, 77:803-29, April, 1915.
- Voluntary or Compulsory Service.* *Nineteenth Century*, 77:1-29, Jan., 1915.
- Coming of Conscription.* *Nineteenth Century*, 77:1296-1313, June, 1915.
- Conscription and Democracy.* *Fortnightly*, 103:1043-56, June, 1915.
- Military Camps for College Students.* *Review of Reviews*, 49:321-6, March, 1914.
- Physical and Military Training for cadets and undergraduates.* *Nineteenth Century*, 75:1114-8, May, 1914.
- Artists as Cannon Fodder.* *Literary Digest*, 49:632-, Oct. 3, 1914.
- Demand for Universal Service.* *Fortnightly*, 100:1047-56, Dec., 1913.
- Young Liberal Pamphlet.* *Nineteenth Century*, 75:446-58, Feb., 1914.
- Scientific Men and Conscription.* *Scientific American*, 111:298, Oct. 10, 1914.
- Attitude of Religious Thought in Australasia towards Compulsory Training.* *Nineteenth Century*, 74:462-8, Sept., 1913.
- Sword and Ploughshare.* *Scribner*, 52:378-9, Sept., 1912.
- Working Classes and a National Army.* *Nineteenth Century*, 71:86-97, Jan., 1912.

EDITORIAL NOTE — The best material on the subject of military training and service is to be found in the bulletins of the Hearings Before the House Committee On Military Affairs, Jan.-Feb., 1916. These probably can be obtained now from the Supt. of Documents. If not write your Congressman for them. A list of documents for sale on this question compiled in the office of the Supt. of Documents is appended herewith.

PUBLICATIONS ON PREPAREDNESS FOR WAR OR INCREASE OF ARMY AND NAVY

For Sale by the

SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

- Speech against militarism*, by Hon. Warren W. Bailey; "I am far from being a militarist, but I do believe in rational preparedness for emergencies," speech by Hon. Julius Kahn; speech against increase, "Every Nation is Confronted by the Danger of a Natural and Cultivated War Spirit," by Hon. S. F. Prouty (V. 52, #38)\$.12
- An Adequate American Navy Necessary*, speech by Hon. Michael Burke (V. 51, #128)08
- Speech favoring a definite policy for the Army*, by Hon. Cyrus Cline; speech against the Increase of the Navy, by Hon. Walter L. Hensley, The War in Europe has Demonstrated that it is not the Dreadnoughts which constitute the Fighting Efficiency of the Navy; and speeches and articles by Hon. Richmond P. Hobson and Hon. Austin M. Knight in favor of a Powerful Navy; "I favor International Disarmament and would gladly vote in favor of the Nation's joining in such a movement, but in the meantime let our Navy be equal to the world responsibilities that we have assumed," speech by Hon. Joseph R. Knowland; speech opposing a large Navy, by Hon. Samuel R. Witherspoon (V. 52, #44)21
- Report on Bill to Establish Council of National Defense (62d Cong. H. Rpt. 584)05
- Speech opposed to militarism*, by Hon. Martin Dies; "Our Inadequate National Defense," speech by Hon. A. P. Gardner; editorial by Mr. Watterson entitled "Shall Our Republic be Prussianized" (V. 52, #4)07
- Debate in the House on Fortifications Appropriation Bill (V. 52, #69)16
- Speech of Hon. Augustus P. Gardner (V. 52, #33)11
- NOTE:—Mr. Gardner, who favors preparedness for war and an increase in our Army and Navy, heads his remarks,

"Army and Navy Manual for Debaters and Others, Facts shown by Extracts from Official Documents, including testimony of Mr. Gardner before the House Committee on Naval Affairs."

<i>Nation's Security, How About Our Army and Navy</i> , Speech on Unpreparedness for War, by Hon. A. P. Gardner (V. 51, #264)08
<i>What is the Matter with the Navy, What Ails the Army</i> , speech by Hon. A. P. Gardner; speech on the Improvement of the National Guard, by Hon. Frank L. Greene; speech against Great Increase in the Army and in relation to Items of Arms and Ammunition in the Appropriation Bill, by Hon. James Hay; and a speech by Hon. Kenneth D. McKellar against Large Increase in the Army and Navy, "I believe that at least 25 years after this awful European War has been closed America will be absolutely free from any possibility of war made on us by a first-class power"; speech in favor of provision of adequate arms and ammunition, by Hon. Richard W. Parker; "A Big Strong Army would build up a Government of Plutocracy," speech by Hon. Percy E. Quinn (V. 52, #36)07
<i>War Terror</i> , speech opposed to the advocates of a big standing Army, by Hon. James Hay; speech by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge in favor of an increase and bringing up-to-date the military equipment (V. 52, #31)14
<i>Speech on the Comparative Value of Various Vessels of the Navy</i> , by Hon. Richmond P. Hobson (V. 51, #110)10
Letter to President Wilson from Hon. E. J. James on our National Defense in favor of developing a citizen soldiery (V. 52, #14)07
<i>Waterways for National Defense</i> , in favor of improving inland waterways so that they can be used by torpedo boats, by Hon. Theodore Justus (V. 52, #28)13
<i>Additional Forces and Equipment Necessary in Time of War</i> by Hon. James C. McLachlan (V. 45, #131)06
<i>Facts of Interest Concerning Military Resources and Policy of the United States</i> , (W2.2:M59)05
<i>Speech on Coast Defense, particularly of Manila</i> , by Hon.	

Clarence B. Miller; speech in favor of an Efficient but Small Standing Army, by Hon. Chas. S. Thomas, (V. 52, #68)09
Organization of the Army and Militia, speech by Hon. L. W. Mott; Peace and War by Hon. Carl Schurz, in favor of Peace (V. 52, #41)13
Debate in the House on Building Two Battleships and the Peace Movement (V. 51, #121)12
Speech opposed to a Larger Navy, by Hon. Edgar W. Saunders (V. 51, #111)10
Speech against constantly enlarging the military establishment and against the retention of the Philippines by the United States, by Hon. Isaac R. Sherwood (V. 50, #27)08
Military Needs of Our Country, speech by Hon. Henry L. Stimson (V. 52, #72)16
Speech against increased expenditures for the military, by Hon. Thomas U. Sisson, (V. 51, #61)11
"How the War Trust is Robbing the Government while Driving Us on toward the Brink of War" (V. 52, #61) ..	.15
Speech on Military Reserve, by Hon. John W. Weeks (V. 52, #5)03
Strength of our Navy compared with the German Navy, speech by Hon. Samuel A. Witherspoon (V. 51, #114) ..	.08
Discussion of a Resolution Authorizing the President to Co-operate with the United Kingdom to bring about a year's rest in preparation for naval warfare (V. 51, #5)10
Speech in favor of Suspension of Battleship Building for One Year, by Hon. Perl D. Decker (V. 51, #18)09
Speech favoring Lessening Armament Expenditures, by Hon. Martin B. Foster (V. 51, #11)13
Some Economic Aspects of War; A Lecture delivered before the Army War College at Washington, D. C., April 11, 1913, by Henry C. Emery, Prof. of Economics, Yale University, A strong argument for preparedness05
Some Information concerning Principal Navies of the World, issued by Office of Naval Intelligence, October, 191505
Annual Report of War Department, 1914, Vol. 1, containing statement of the land forces of the various countries; Table showing the strength of the Army of the United	

States, June 30, 1913, and June 30, 1914, with losses from all causes between those dates; Statement of Appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year 1914, and other information germane to the subject55
Report on the Organization of the Land Forces of the United States, containing broad outlines of comprehensive military policy of the General Staff10
Speech by Hon. W. J. Bryan, delivered Nov. 1, 1915, at Jamestown, Pa., on War in Europe and Its Lessons for Us. (V. 53, #3)14
NOTE:—This speech is opposed to further increase of the Army and Navy of U. S.	
Efficiency in National Guards, address by Hon. Wilbur F. Sadler, (V. 53, #3) quoted above.	
Military and Naval Expansion, including Hon. Claude Kitchin's statement on the Nation's Preparedness and letter by Hon. C. H. Tavenner, (V. 53, #5)06
Manufacture of Armor, speech by Hon. B. R. Tillman (V. 53, #4)05
General Debate in the House on Suspension of Building Battleships (In following numbers of the Daily Congressional Record) :	

Vol. 50

No. 160.....\$.05

Vol. 51

No. 4......07

No. 6......14

No. 10......14

No. 14......16

No. 21......09

V. # Indicates that the above quoted debates, speeches, etc. are to be found in the *Daily Congressional Records*, in which are recorded the proceedings of Congress.

President Wilson's Third Annual Message to Congress, containing recommendations for preparedness (V. 53, #2) ..	\$.09
Speeches on Preparedness, by Hon. W. J. Cary, Hon. L. C. Dyer, and Hon. J. J. Britt (V. 53, #8)09

•

**EXEMPTION OF LABOR UNIONS
FROM ANTI-TRUST
LEGISLATION**

•

EXEMPTION OF LABOR UNIONS FROM ANTI-TRUST LEGISLATION

*SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE (KANSAS) vs.
OKLAHOMA A. & M. COLLEGE*

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, MINOR E. HICKMAN, SOUTHWESTERN
COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Among the serious problems confronting the American people to-day, that of labor stands in the foremost ranks. The constant struggle between labor and capital is trespassing on the rights of the public. The renewal of the Colorado Coal Strike, which caused so much trouble two years ago, the threatened strike of the 400,000 railway employees, and the restiveness of labor in general testify that our industrial conditions are in a turmoil.

In all the arguments for preparedness there has been only here and there a hint of internal preparedness. In regard to this condition, Theodore Roosevelt says: "Military preparedness, to be effective, must be founded upon industrial and financial preparedness." It is obvious, then, that a question dealing with labor is worthy of our attention.

The contention upheld by the affirmative this evening

is already a law upon our statute books, in the form of the Clayton Amendment, passed by Congress in 1914. This law removed the ordinary activities of labor unions from the operation of the Sherman Law. According to former Attorney General Wickersham, "the law is sound and binding." It is worthy of note that Congress saw fit to classify labor organizations with those of farmers rather than with those of trusts. Hence, the negative are forced to assume much of the burden of proof this evening. They have undertaken to oppose an issue which has already received the sanction of all three departments of our national government.

The argument of the affirmative will not be a brief for labor. We shall not dwell at length upon the "deplorable condition of the down-trodden workingman," and of his small chance to rise in the scale of human progress. Instead of a brief for labor it shall be our purpose to give you a presentation of facts in the light of broad, national welfare.

Is the organization of labor unions necessary? Labor, capital, the courts, and the public in general answer in the affirmative. The *New York Journal of Commerce* says: "All must admit that labor unions are not only necessary, . . . but highly beneficial." Justice Holmes says: "Combination on the part of capital is potent and powerful. Combination on the part of labor is the necessary and desirable counterpart, if the battle is to be carried out in a fair and equal way." Senator Hoar says: "The Sherman Anti-Trust Law must allow laborers to make associations, combinations, or contracts for the sake

of maintaining or advancing their wages." Ex-President Taft declares that "Without such combinations we may well doubt whether the present condition of the wage earners would be nearly so good as it is to-day." President Welburn, of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, admits that "Without the union men are at the mercy of their employers." Concerning the economic importance of labor unions, the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, in the report of the Colorado Coal Strike, said: "Men and women who are economically subservient cannot be politically free. The forms and guarantees of American institutions are meaningless in communities where the many must depend upon the favor of the few for the opportunity to obtain food, clothing, and shelter." With such an array of testimony as to the necessity of labor unions before us, the opposition cannot deny that organization on the part of labor is essential to the welfare of the workingman.

Now, it is only natural that at times labor unions are subject to excesses and abuses of power. But we should not, on that account, deny them the only means of dealing effectively with organizations of capital. These capitalistic combinations have monopolized almost every commodity of daily use. But they seek to control, not only the product of labor, but the laborer himself. If, when the workers are borne down by unbearable conditions, they decide to strike, they are threatened with prosecution under the Sherman Law. Representative Green of Iowa states that in a case in which he represented some laborers against the Illinois Central Railway

Company, they had been threatened by the attorney for the railroad with prosecution under that anti-trust law, if they should decide to strike.

With these facts in mind, it cannot be denied that collective bargaining on the part of labor is necessary, if the laborers are not to be completely subservient to their employers. And the negative must admit that the function of labor unions is collective bargaining. Since this is true, labor unions must be accorded the right to exercise this function effectively, even wholly independent of the permission of the employers. Hence, though the negative may try to avoid the issue by admitting all that has been said thus far, a mere admission of the necessity of the unions is valueless, as I have already indicated, if they are refused those rights and powers which will enable them to carry out the legitimate aims of the organizations.

The issue before us this evening is: Can labor unions maintain effective organization while included with trusts as "combinations in restraint of trade"?

This involves three questions:

(1) Are the two classes of organizations nearly enough identical to justify the inclusion?

(2) Are the unions unjustly injured by the inclusion?

(3) Can the unions be kept subservient to the general public if the exemption is granted?

The affirmative will not contend that the original intention was to exempt labor unions from the operation of the Sherman Law, though a majority of those active in framing the bill so stated in Congress. Furthermore,

that it has been the intention of Congress all along to exempt labor unions from anti-trust laws is evidenced by the passage of the Clayton Act. But the intention of the framers of anti-trust laws is not the most important point; and we wish to discuss the merits of the issue,—to defend the principle justifying the exemption.

We are not asking that labor unions be exempted from all law. We are asking that exemption be granted only "in anti-trust legislation," where such legislation pertains to "combinations in restraint of trade." We are asking that organizations of labor be recognized as legal institutions, with power to carry out the legitimate purposes of their organization.

The term "exemption" is here used to mean, "there should be separate legislation for," and the affirmative will later outline principles which should be followed in labor legislation.

The negative will doubtless argue that exemption would be class legislation. But what are the facts? First, that exemption is not an innovation in legislation. We have any number of laws that may be termed "class legislation." Notable ones are the Federal Income Tax, which exempts all incomes under \$3,000 annually; the Corporation Tax, which exempts labor, agricultural, and horticultural organizations; and the Federal Bankruptcy Law, which excludes farmers from its benefits.

The argument from class legislation will not hold good. It is impossible to guarantee justice to labor and capital if they are both placed under the same law. Surely it is not unfair legislation to frame different laws for two

classes of organizations inherently different and employing different methods. Justice Field declares: "Legislation, in carrying out a public purpose, if it affects alike all persons similarly situated, is not within the Fourteenth Amendment." President Wilson declares that no law which gives the workingmen freedom to act in their own interests can be properly regarded as class legislation, or as anything but a measure taken in the interests of the whole people. Justice McKenna, in a recent decision, said: "A restraint of competition in a combination of laborers does not demonstrate that legislation which does not include this class is illegal." In short, exemption is only the use of the power of classification which Congress continuously and rightfully uses.

The argument from class legislation offers no loophole through which the opposition may escape the main issue. The question is not whether a distinction is actually made, but whether such distinction is just and equitable, and whether the results promote the welfare of the greatest number, and thereby contribute to the general good.

The negative may try to stake the issue on whether or not labor unions at times restrain trade, and that, if any of their acts at any time bear any resemblance to restraint of trade, they should be dealt with by the same laws as combinations that do restrain trade. But we of the affirmative believe that the real point at issue is: Are combinations of capital and labor so similar in purpose, and are their activities so similar that they should be dealt with by the same laws?

We admit that labor unions are not entirely altruistic in purpose, but we contend that they are more nearly so than capital. To a very large degree labor unions work for the benefit of the public. Says Justice Furman of the Oklahoma Court of Appeals: "Labor has a mind and soul, and is animated by sympathy, love, and hope; capital is inanimate, soulless material." Lincoln, Brandeis, and others have made similar declarations.

The associations of workingmen are the result of a purpose to secure for the members rights which are conceded to be more easily obtainable by concerted action than by individuals acting singly. These organizations seek only to control human labor, which is inseparable from life itself. Says the eminent Hoar: "When a laborer is trying to raise his wages or shorten his hours of labor, he is dealing with something that touches more closely than anything else, the government and character of the state."

Now, what is the purpose in view when corporations organize? Manifestly, it is to reap the benefits of the fruit of labor. Their purpose is to exact from the public, to monopolize, and to apply to individual use wealth which ought properly and for the public benefit to be generally distributed over the country. Plainly, there is a difference in their aims. Representative Baily of Pennsylvania says that they differ fundamentally in character, and since they do differ, "then the contention that labor unions and trusts should be statutorily bound together is without merit."

Now, since labor unions and trusts are both organized

for the purpose of deriving benefits by the organization, it might seem logically to follow that the same law should apply to both. But there is a vast difference between benefits derived for the purpose of accumulating wealth and benefits derived for the purpose of meeting the very necessities of life. There is a difference between men united for the purpose of securing employment and bettering living conditions, and an organization as a trust, to monopolize the necessities of life, the beginning, the existence, and the continuance of which organization is unlawful. These are the distinctions, these are the contrasts, these are the differences. And with these distinctions and differences before us it is manifestly illogical to contend that labor unions and capitalistic combinations are similar or have the same purposes in view.

But let us go further, and study the question from the angle of the material dealt with. It is the express purpose of anti-trust laws to apply to monopolies of commodities. If it can be shown that labor is a commodity, an article of commerce, then the proposed exemption is unjust; but if it can be shown that labor is not merchandise, then the proposed exemption is just and right. If the opposition fail to prove conclusively that labor is a commodity, then their whole line of argument is invalidated.

The Clayton Law plainly states that the "Labor of a human being is not a commodity or an article of commerce." Henry R. Seager, professor of political economy at Columbia University, says: "The labor power of a human being is not, and cannot be regarded as an

article of commerce." Victor Murdock said: "I am in favor of the act which will exempt labor unions from the Sherman Law, because I believe that labor is not a commodity."

The only place where the anti-trust law can rightfully apply to labor unions is where they unite with their employers to form a real combination to control a commodity. Then the labor unions, as such, have ceased to exist. The combination has taken upon itself the function of capital and is subject to laws applying thereto. But heretofore when an enraged public has struck out against this oppression, the law permitted the prosecution of labor entirely apart from capital. The position of labor, in such circumstances, is necessarily much more conspicuous than that of capital, although capital shares in the spoils. So the public, anxious to punish some one, usually made labor "the goat."

When President Wilson signed the Clayton Bill, he said: "Justice has been done the laborer. His labor is no longer to be treated as if it were merely an inanimate object of commerce, disconnected from the fortunes and happiness of a human being, to be dealt with as an article of sale and barter." The *Literary Digest* quotes the President as saying: "The Clayton Act does not exempt labor unions if they commit acts in restraint of trade." And we do not believe that the President contradicts himself in these two statements, because the legitimate activities of labor unions do not include acts in restraint of trade.

Since labor is not a commodity, and since it is the

function of capital directly to control commodities, it follows that labor should not be subject to anti-trust laws. For the primary purpose of anti-trust laws is to prevent restraint of trade in the marketing of commodities. As the United States Supreme Court said, in the case, *United States versus Patterson*: "The anti-trust law should apply only to combinations in restraint of trade by 'engrossing, monopolizing, or grasping the market.'" Professor Seager expresses the same view when he says: "Anti-trust laws should apply only between manufacturers and the public when the former combine to fix prices to the detriment of the unorganized, consuming public."

When we legislate to the detriment of the unorganized workingmen we are undermining the very foundations of our state and society. The argument that labor is a commodity will not hold. The labor of a nation is the life of the nation, and that certainly is not an article to be bought and sold. "The legal quality of the commodity is property, but the legal quality of the workingman is citizenship. A different principle of sociology and justice applies to these before Congress or the courts."

The methods of restraining trade by capital and labor are so radically different that they should not be included under the same laws. Brandeis says: "There should be a means of equality between labor unions and trusts, and this equality lies in separate legislation." Lyman Abbott, editor of the *Outlook*, says: "Since labor unions and trusts are formed for entirely different pur-

poses they should be on a different basis of control." Professor Seager pleads for "a trades-union law, to regulate and construct." And Ex-President Taft, conservative though he is, says: "Managers, vested with the control of capital, can hide the truth and clothe their proceedings with a cloak that makes the discovery of illegal methods and the punishment difficult. With combinations of labor it is different. The cooperation of great numbers is necessary when they resort to methods of oppression and tyranny; and their lawlessness is generally the lawlessness of assault and open violence, for the punishment of which the usual statutes of crimes and misdemeanors, and the ordinary machinery for the enforcement of such laws should be sufficient."

With this very radical statement from this extremely conservative statesman, the affirmative close their first argument in behalf of exemption of labor unions from the operation of anti-trust laws.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, HOWARD WHITE, '16,
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: Labor unions are not literary societies or social clubs. They are the means by which workingmen protect themselves against the power of combined capital. They are the only means by which the workers can deal collectively with their employer. Manifestly, their united power is greater than their individual efforts in seeking more reasonable working conditions, so that many employers oppose this collective bargaining. But for this very reason, the organization

and effective functioning of labor must be guaranteed, entirely apart from the approval of its employer.

Now, effective functioning of labor unions, my colleague showed, does not include acts "in restraint of trade" because the legitimate activities of labor unions do not include control over the marketing of commodities, and it is only to this field that "restraint of trade" should apply.

This distinction, removing the existence and legitimate activities of organized labor from the scope of the Anti-trust Law, was accomplished by the Clayton Amendment. Organized labor had felt that, "It lay within the power of any administration, at any time, to begin proceedings to dissolve any organization of labor." So, to "remove all doubt as to the legality of the existence and operations of these organizations," the words of the committee which drafted the amendment, Congress enacted: "Nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, under the anti-trust laws."

Besides doubt as to the legality of their existence, previous to this Congressional action, organized labor had been hampered by two unfair discriminations: (1) By a misuse of the injunctive power by certain courts; and (2) By applying the anti-trust law to labor, but not to capital, in their mutual dealings.

In the first place, under the guise of enforcing the anti-trust law, injunctions have been issued against labor unions, as "combinations in restraint of trade, forbidding

the workers, individually or collectively, to continue to perform peaceful acts which are essential to maintaining the effectiveness of their organization." Under some indefinite charge of "restraint of trade" there is not a single tool of labor's defense which has not been forbidden by reactionary courts whose respect for the employers' property rights is equalled only by their disregard of human rights.

I know the negative contention is that strikes, picketing and primary boycotts are legal, and this exemption merely legalizes sympathetic strikes and secondary boycotts. But the New York Bar report for 1913 lists forty-five decisions, including seven by the Supreme Court, which declare strikes illegal and efforts to unionize shops unlawful; which forbid boycotts; which make picketing unlawful; or impose similar restrictions on labor's activities. And this has been done because labor, in dealing collectively with its employers, is necessarily a combination and a hostile court could not distinguish between collective bargaining with the employer and restraint of trade in commodities. Furthermore, Senate Document 504 of the 60th Congress, First Session, reprints twenty-four injunctions which forbid either boycotting or picketing, or both, even to the all-inclusive extent of orders enjoining the Iron Molders of North America from "persuading in any manner, any person to join or further their conspiracy or any conspiracy to compel this plaintiff to give up or abate, in any way its control over its said factory and business" or "from

doing any act whatever in furtherance of any conspiracy or combination to restrain or obstruct the operation of said business."

"Injunctions have forbidden workers to use public highways, to assemble peaceably to consider their wrongs, to pay strike benefits, to induce other workers to join the strike, to exercise the right of lawful assemblage, free speech and free press": all because courts were of the opinion that these acts were in furtherance of "combinations in restraint of trade." Was labor actually controlling the market for commodities and seeking to dictate the price the public should pay? Not at all. Labor was denied this right because, in dealing with its employer, union labor is necessarily a combination, and hostile courts, anxious to protect the employer, have found evidences of "restraint of trade."

In the second place, this inclusion of labor unions with trusts was unjust, because the dealings of unions with their employers were almost invariably forbidden, while corresponding activities of employers were legal. Boycotts were "in restraint of trade" but employers' blacklists were lawful. A strike was often held illegal because it restrained trade, but the employers' lockouts were always justified on the ground of economic necessity or similar reasons. Efforts to unionize a shop restrained trade, but the employers' efforts to keep out unions did not restrain trade. To discharge men for belonging to a union did not restrain trade, but the men were denied protection of the law if, through their former employer's influence, all other positions were closed

to them. In short, courts gave the employer a vested right to conduct his business as he saw fit, but withheld from labor the right to conduct its organization as it saw fit.

Let us take a particular instance. The Buck Stove and Range Company excluded all competition by combining with a dealer in each community, and thereby acquired power to compel every one to pay its price or go without stoves and ranges. But when the union men, to whom this company denied the right of establishing fair and reasonable hours, refused to patronize this company and asserted its right to free speech and freedom of the press in calling attention to the company's unfairness, then the court intervened and protected the company.

In all other respects, this company was without protection from external forces and competitive conditions. The agents of sixty competitors were free to make whatever representations they pleased, truthful or untruthful, about this company's goods, and thus to boycott them to the fullest extent, narrowing its market and destroying its business, and doing this from purely selfish motives. A court would treat an application for an injunction against these practices as violations of the anti-trust law as an absurdity, saying they were inseparable from the competitive system under which we live. But when union labor, seeking better working conditions and acting in its own interests and in pursuit of its legitimate objects, laid down a fair condition on which it would patronize the Buck Stove and Range Company and de-

clared that until this condition was accepted it would withhold its patronage, the entire membership of union labor was enjoined from making even this negative attitude effective.

In dealing thus at length with the analogous activities of employers and laborers, I have done so only to show that the struggle between capital and labor is really competitive. There is an irrepressible, inevitable conflict between the two forces with a just division of the joint products of capital and labor as the issue. But courts, over-zealous to protect property rights when labor tries to get a fairer share of the profits, have resorted to the anti-trust law and punished labor for "combining to restrain trade." Yet these same courts do not apply the anti-trust law when capital, in competing with labor, tries to get larger shares of the profits.

This unfair discrimination was scathingly condemned by Federal Judge Caldwell in *Hopkins vs. Oxley Stove Company*. After noting the almost unlimited privileges accorded capital in dealing with labor, while labor's "action, however open, peaceful, and orderly, is branded as a 'conspiracy,'" he said, "What is competition when done by capital is conspiracy when done by labor. No amount of verbal dexterity can conceal or justify this glaring discrimination."

Why not apply the anti-trust law to both? may be asked. The answer is: The anti-trust law cannot rightfully apply to either. My colleague showed that this law should apply only to combinations injuring the public through controlling the market for commodities.

The mutual dealing of employers and workers, while not wholly unrelated, are outside the scope of this law. Congress, by freeing the legitimate activities of labor from this law, only placed them on an equality with the corresponding activities of their employers which have always been exempt.

Combinations of labor must have, in the words of Justice Holmes, "The same liberty that combined capital has, to support their interests by argument, persuasion, and the bestowal or refusal of those advantages which they otherwise lawfully control."

I grant that the full exercise of these advantages which Justice Holmes would accord organized labor might have little resemblance to parlor games. But we are dealing now with a competitive scheme of things and are only interested to see that each side is accorded fair play. We must realize, as Lord Coleridge pointed out in the great English case of *Mogul Steamship Company vs. McGregor*, "Trade not being infinite, what one man gains, another loses. In the hand-to-hand war of commerce . . . men fight without much thought of others, except a desire to excel or defeat them. The same conflict goes on and is unavoidable between capital and labor. . . . There is the same justification for organized labor resorting to the legitimate and recognized methods of warfare in its hard and unequal struggle against capital, that there is in the conflicts of capital with capital."

Here we must ask: What constitute "legitimate methods" in labor's competition with capital? The op-

position say the sympathetic strike and the secondary boycott are unlawful. Gentlemen of the decision, they are legal to-day, so far as the provisions of the anti-trust law are concerned. Professor Seager, one of the nation's greatest political economists, and former Attorney-General Wickersham say the Clayton Amendment legalized them. And Samuel Gompers holds the same opinion. Why does not organized labor use the secondary boycott and the sympathetic strike in the terrible way the opposition picture? Because labor knows just as well as any one else knows who takes time to think, that it takes more than mere exemption from an anti-trust law to give labor the right to do anything it pleases, irrespective of public welfare.

Injury to the public, not the mere fact that a sympathetic strike or a secondary boycott is in progress, is now the basis for prosecution of organized labor. Is the public always injured? Let us take a particular instance. When Mr. Loewe refused to recognize their union, the Danbury Hatters and their fellow-workers in the American Federation of Labor tried to enforce a secondary boycott by refusing to deal with any one who has purchased hats from this company. Courts applied the anti-trust law and assessed threefold damages, saying the Danbury Hatters had conspired to restrain trade. True, some people were unable to procure this particular brand of hat because dealers preferred not to handle them. Does that constitute injury to the public? These hats could not have been obtained if, through the stress of competition with eighty-one other manufacturers, this

company had failed. In either case, injury to the public would have been only a disability to wear this particular brand of hat. To be sure, the employer's business was injured, but this injury is inseparable from the existing competitive system. Judge Noyes in *National Fireproofing Co. v. Mason Builders' Association* (169 Fed. Rep. 260) said: "The damage to such persons may be serious—it may even extend to their ruin—but if it is inflicted by a combination in the legitimate pursuit of its own affairs it is (*damnum absque injuria*)" not actionable. As long as we do not protect the employer from the other injurious effects of competition, we discriminate unjustly against the workers if we do not accord them, in the words of Justice Holmes, "the same liberty that combined capital has."

In conclusion: To free organized labor from all threats of dissolution; to remove a dangerous power which permitted hostile courts to enjoin any or all of labor's activities because they bore some resemblance to restraints of trade; and finally, to give combinations of labor the same freedom which is accorded combinations of capital in their mutual dealings, leaving the anti-trust law to apply to "combinations of manufacturers aiming to take advantage of scattered and unorganized consumers": for these reasons, Congress saw fit to pass by an almost unanimous vote, and President Wilson signed, the proposition which the affirmative is defending, the exemption of labor unions from construction as "combinations in restraint of trade."

Experience of eighteen months which have passed

since this proposition became substantive law, has found nothing to indicate that labor will take undue advantage of this exemption. This attitude is due to two facts. First, as former President Taft points out, the activities of unions which have been termed "restraints of trade" are largely "crimes of open violence, for the punishment of which the usual statute of crimes and misdemeanors and the ordinary machinery for the enforcement of such laws should be sufficient." Labor unions are still subject to these laws, and should the necessity arise, as it did in the Colorado and West Virginia troubles, the whole force of our national government will be ready to guarantee peace and safety to its citizens.

In the second place, this exemption has caused none of the trouble which the opposition would lead you to expect because, with the granting of this right, labor unions have realized the corresponding duty. Labor has been given a more responsible place in our nation, and this new responsibility has been accepted in a way which justifies the expectation of Congress that "liberty, and more of it, is safe in the hands of the workingmen of the nation."

But we should not stop with this. Recognition of the duty that organized labor owes the public should be enforced by constructive legislation. We need, as Professor Seager of Columbia points out, a constructive trades-union law which will deal with unions, as unions, and not, as in past constructions, by a process of refined reasoning, include them with trusts as "combinations in restraint of trade."

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, MINOR E. HICKMAN,
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The negative have insisted that the proposed exemption would be class legislation, and therefore unconstitutional. In support of our contention that this exemption would not be out of keeping with the spirit of our constitution, I have pointed out that "class legislation," so called, is practiced all along by Congress, citing the Federal Income Tax, the Corporation Tax, and the Federal Bankruptcy Law as examples. I have also quoted Justice Field, Justice McKenna, and President Wilson, who all declare that such legislation as this is not class legislation. But as these seem not to have been sufficient to convince the gentlemen of the opposition I shall give you a few more statements no less striking. In the case of *Flint versus Stone, Tracy & Co.*, the United States Supreme Court ruled: "As to the objection that certain organizations of labor, etc., are exempted from the operation of the law, we find nothing in them to invalidate the law." The court asserted the right of Congress to exercise the power of classification in legislation. The *Outlook* for June 13, 1914, declares that the "exemption" provision in the Clayton Amendment is an attempt to render the law consistent with the change in industrial conditions. The question as to whether there should be a distinction in law between one category or group and another should be determined by the nature of the difference between the two groups. If that difference has a material bear-

ing on the material object of the law it should be recognized. Senator Thompson of Kansas says: "The question is not whether a distinction is actually made, but whether such distinction is just and equitable, and whether the results promote the welfare of the greatest number, and thereby contribute to the general good." Representative Baily says: "To prohibit or regulate combinations of property owners, whose property is charged with a public interest, to the exclusion of combinations of wage earners, would be both consistent and sound." The eminent Senator Hoar says: "As legislators we may constitutionally and wisely allow labor to make associations, combinations, or contracts for the sake of maintaining and advancing their wages." The International Harvester Company was ousted from Missouri by a state law very similar to the Clayton Amendment. The company appealed the case. One reason given for the appeal was that it discriminated against venders of commodities and in favor of labor unions. Justice McKenna, in delivering the opinion of the court, said: "It may be there is a restraint of competition in a combination of laborers, but that does not demonstrate that legislation which does not include either combination is illegal. . . . The power of classification which the legislature may exercise demonstrates that some latitude must be allowed to legislative judgment."

The negative have also referred to labor unions as having the nature of trusts. A trust is defined as "A species of combination organized by individuals or corporations for the purpose of monopolizing the manufac-

ture of, or traffic in, various articles and commodities." Labor unions are organized for the primary purpose of controlling their labor power, which is not a commodity; therefore, they should not be included under the same legislation as trusts. Daniel Davenport, counsel for the American Anti-Boycott Association, says: "There is nothing to be found in any decision of the courts holding that labor unions are any form of trust." Now, since labor unions are not trusts, they cannot justly be prosecuted under the same laws. There is need for separate legislation. Taft says: "Abuses growing out of the enormous power of combinations of labor have not evolved the same regulative tendency as with combinations of capital." He says further: "The abuses of one class of offenders may be of such a character as to require more elaborate machinery to prevent and punish them than that of another. This is a true distinction between combined capital and combined labor." Likewise, L. D. Brandeis, Professor Seager, Representatives Thompson and Murray of Oklahoma, all agree that justice can be done to labor only by separate legislation.

The opposition have said that labor influences the marketing of commodities. While it is true that labor's part in the production of a commodity may indirectly influence the marketing, yet any attempt to apply anti-trust laws to these activities of labor must result in an injustice and hampering of labor's activities. For instance, a peaceful strike, which the opposition admit is perfectly legal, influences production, and thereby affects the distribution or marketing of the commodity. There may

even be financial loss to the employer, but this gives no reason for prosecution of the workmen. As Mr. Taft said in a judicial decision: The loss which an employer sustains by a strike "arises from the exercise of the workman's lawful right to work for such wages as he chooses, and to get as high rates as he can. The loss may be caused by the workman, but it gives no right of action against him."

The negative have tried to make much of conditions in England. They have declared that after the exemption in England there was a great strike. They might have added just as truthfully that there were great strikes before the exemption also. We would inform the opposition that the laborers in England are very poorly paid and poorly educated in comparison with those of America, and hence have not the intelligence of our laborers. But even considering these facts we have the statement of Professor Seager that "general satisfaction has resulted in England because of the exemption." The gentlemen of the negative say that the proposed exemption will legalize the sympathetic strike and the secondary boycott. But John R. Commons says: "The arguments now used to declare the sympathetic strike and the secondary boycott illegal, are those formerly used to declare the strike and the primary boycott illegal." And the strike and the boycott, even in large dimensions sometimes, are necessary if labor unions are to be able to function effectively. In their final report on the Colorado Coal Strike, The Committee on Industrial Relations said: "It is only by ostracizing and intimidating

strike breakers that workmen can discourage the practice, and thereby win in the struggle for higher wages or for industrial democracy." Force is necessary if the unions are to be anything more than mere names.

In closing, let me reiterate that we are not asking for exemption of labor from all law. Quoting Mr. Taft again, it is "not intended to make the members of such associations a privileged class, free from the operation of the general laws. This is a mere declaratory statement. It authorizes the existence and operation. It forbids restraint of members when lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof."

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, HOWARD WHITE,
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: A question should always be interpreted in the most reasonable way. The terrible results which must follow the granting of this exemption, according to our worthy opponents' statements, if taken at their face value, would make the granting of this exemption absurd and positively dangerous. Now, if that is bound to be the result, the question is not debatable and both Congress and President Wilson have committed a crime in enacting legislation looking to this end.

But the opposition, in making such an unwarranted assumption, have overlooked two things. First, that capital is organized to-day and through its organization deals with labor which may or may not be organized, and second, these functions of combined capital have

never been included under the anti-trust law. Organized capital can drive a better bargain with unorganized labor, so it prefers, as in the cases of those great combinations, the Steel Trust and the Standard Oil combine, to deal individually with its tens of thousands of workers. Both oppose all forms of organization among their men. Now experts, studying the psychological and sociological aspects, say that the workers do not and cannot give their best service so long as an arbitrary paternalism decides what wages they shall receive, how long they shall work, and what conditions shall be maintained in the shops. These men say that labor should be allowed to organize, entirely apart from the wishes of their employers. (Industrial Competition and Combination: Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July, 1912.) Laborers and political and social scientists believe that labor can organize, as capital has organized, if it is not hampered by inclusion with trusts as combinations controlling commodities. To that end, Congress passed the legislation which we are advocating.

Labor leaders do not expect or desire that this change in the law shall give them license to do anything they please, statements of the opposition to the contrary notwithstanding. In support of this statement, I have a letter from Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor. "Labor does not and never has asked for exemption from all law. Whenever workingmen organize for control of articles or commodities, and thereby enter into the same field as trusts, there should be no exemption protecting them from the operation of

trust legislation." To misinterpret the question so as to make it appear that it grants more than even those who asked for it desire or expect, we contend is absurd and only indicates that those who place such an extreme interpretation on the question do not have any grounds to oppose the question on its merits.

The gentlemen of the opposition admit the legality of the peaceful strike, primary boycott and the peaceful picket. Let me call your attention to what Professor John R. Commons of Wisconsin University says in the Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, of which he was a member. "The arguments now used to declare the secondary boycott illegal are those formerly used to declare the strike and the primary boycott illegal. Our recommendation simply carries forward another step the effort to secure equality between organized capital and organized labor." But our worthy opponents, in their desire to concede something to labor, yet make it appear that the exemption should not be granted, have involved themselves in grave inconsistencies. They refer to the threatened strike of the railway men as a "sympathetic strike." I beg to differ with them. Each of the four unions concerned in the threatened strike have requested certain things of their employers. Evidently, this is not a sympathetic strike where one union strikes to help another which has a grievance. Instead, this is a plain, ordinary peaceful strike, which the opposition say is perfectly legal and is not affected by the anti-trust law. Therefore, exemption or no exemption, the anti-trust law cannot apply.

Furthermore, even if it were a sympathetic strike, even if all were striking to obtain relief for one particular group, even then the anti-trust law would not apply unless labor could be treated as a commodity, and the opposition admit that it is not. For the trainmen possess only their labor power, and labor power not being a commodity, as my colleague proved, and as Congress has statutorily declared, the trainmen could not be held as violators of the anti-trust law. They also refer to the Cincinnati ice-workers' strike. Whether they were justified in striking or not, that strike was not dealt with and could not be dealt with by the federal anti-trust law. It was purely local. How was it dealt with? The same methods still apply, exemption or no exemption.

Just because the trainmen or the ice workers of Cincinnati or Chicago, or any other group of men, organized into unions, are not subject to the anti-trust law does not mean that the public does not have control over them. But that is what the opposition tried to make appear. They imagine a terrible condition which must follow the granting of this exemption, which, they would have you believe, gives labor an absolutely free hand to do anything it pleases. We cannot blame them for making such a terrible thing out of this exemption. That is probably the only means they have to show why it should not be granted. No wonder they have tried to make it appear that the Clayton Amendment does not mean what it says, for that would mean that we have been living for eighteen months under the exemption which they say will surely bring such terrible results. It

is idle to assert that this exemption ties the public, hand and foot, and delivers it to the mercy of labor unions. Public welfare is the supreme law. If the ordinary machinery of the law cannot deal with organized labor, and we have quoted Taft to show that it can, back of the ordinary machinery is that great reserve force, the police power of the state, which, in self-preservation, can supersede all ordinary law, and, striking directly at the disturbing force, secure to America's citizens the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It may have seemed to you, gentlemen of the decision, that one side was trying to prove its contention by citing the greatest possible number of crimes committed against labor; the other side, the greatest possible number of crimes committed by labor. I hardly need to point out that this is entirely beside the issue. While the affirmative have cited wrongs done to labor, it is not the wrongs, as such, to which we have endeavored to call your attention, but only to the cause of these wrongs: That labor, in dealing collectively with its employer, has been subject to a misconstrued anti-trust law, but the employer, in dealing with his employees, has always been exempt. We appreciate the skilful and forcible way in which our opponents have stated their case. But we sincerely believe they have obscured the issue by emphasizing all the wrongs that union labor has ever been charged with committing. This may have prejudiced some against union labor. But it is not the issue we are debating, whether unions are beneficial or not. Further, we have shown that instances of what they considered unwise use

of labor's power could not, by any possible construction, be dealt with by the anti-trust law. If union labor's activity threatens the public welfare, enact positive legislation to correct these abuses, but do not cite instances of labor's activity which do not come within the scope of this law, and then argue "if this exemption is granted, labor will do these things."

We admire and would do all in our power to aid our worthy opponents in securing an even-handed justice. But we still contend that this even-handed justice can only be assured when the mutual dealings of employers and workers are subject to one and the same law, but this law entirely apart from the anti-trust law, which should apply only between organized manufacturers and unorganized, widely-scattered consumers.

Experience teaches that a desire to win often leads debaters, unconsciously, to distort facts and misinterpret arguments. In the clash of conflicting arguments, you have doubtless often wondered what is true. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the affirmative's contentions, let me briefly summarize.

Our arguments have been largely explanatory of a law which has been on the statute books for eighteen months. While the negative questioned its validity, we have shown that Section 6 of the Clayton Amendment guarantees the existence and effective functioning of labor unions. We have shown where the Supreme Court upheld a similar provision in the Missouri law, indicating that this provision is constitutional. Thus the affirmative has the support of all three branches of our national government.

My colleague proved that the exemption is just because labor is not a commodity. Hence a combination of workers possessing only their labor power does not restrain trade. Labor may combine with capital to restrain trade, but this combination is not, and should not be, exempt from construction as "in restraint of trade" within the meaning of the question.

I have explained that this construction, permitting organized labor to be prosecuted for combining, was unjust (1) because unions were liable to dissolution; (2) because the anti-trust law easily afforded a basis for unjust injunctions; and (3) because in the mutual dealings of labor and its employers, the activities of labor were subject to the anti-trust law while the corresponding activities of employers were exempt.

Finally, this exemption points the way to constructive legislation to deal with the mutual relations of labor and of capital, leaving the anti-trust law to apply to those who attempt to monopolize the market for any commodity, to their own undue enrichment and to the detriment of the public.

*SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE vs. KANSAS
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY*

FIRST NEGATIVE, THOMAS A. WILLIAMS, SOUTHWESTERN
COLLEGE, '16

Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: In anti-trust legislation, should labor unions be exempted from construction as combinations in restraint of trade?

Before entering into the negative discussion of the question, let us see what is actually involved therein. Let us bear in mind throughout this debate that the question does not concern itself with labor in the mass. It concerns itself only with organized labor, the labor unions.

In view of this, the negative call your attention to three facts involved in this question:

1. Organized Labor is asking exemption only for itself. It is unconcerned about the remaining ninety per cent. of unorganized labor.

2. Organized Labor is asking exemption from only one thing, namely, from construction as combinations in restraint of trade. The motive that lies hidden behind this request must be accepted by faith as being lofty in purpose and altruistic in intent.

3. Organized Labor wants it made possible to dictate to every court that in any anti-trust legislation, or application of the present statutes, Labor Unions shall not be construed or interpreted as being "combinations in restraint of trade" no matter what their conduct may be.

In the passage of the recent Clayton Anti-Trust Law, Organized Labor professes to have gained the goal of its ambition. But, Honorable Judges, the Clayton Act does not grant to Labor Unions any more privileges than was allowed them under the Sherman Act. It merely emphasizes the exemption of the legitimate activities of Organized Labor from construction as "combinations in restraint of trade" and guarantees to them a legal existence. The Act, other than this, was but a political measure designed to get control of the votes of Organized

Labor. In 1908, Samuel Gompers said that the American Federation of Labor stood ready to throw its united support to that political party that would promise to it an immunity from prosecution for its actions. In 1912 the Democratic Party made this promise and the redemption of that pledge was the present Clayton Act. The framers of the bill, as well as those who have judicially passed upon it, are as a unit in their opinion that the law accords to Labor Unions no other privileges than they have heretofore enjoyed.

Now, Honorable Judges, since it is evident that Organized Labor is not exempt from prosecution when it restrains trade, let us go a little further in our analysis.

The affirmative dwell with emphasis upon the fact that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or an article of commerce, as is recognized by the Clayton Act. Now, the negative agree fully with the affirmative in this contention. Human labor is not a commodity. Neither is capital a commodity. According to scientific economics there are only three factors of production, viz., Land, Labor, and Capital. These three entities in themselves produce nothing. It is only as they work together that they produce a commodity. Capital cannot do it alone; Labor cannot do it alone; but both working together do, and the question at issue, then, is: *In placing the produced commodity before the general public, does capital or organized labor in its practices restrain trade?*

Before going further, Honorable Judges, the negative want to call your attention to another fact. We stand

for a policy of positive fairness to both the Labor Unions and Capital. We favor everything in the way of

1. The right to organize.
2. The right to strike.
3. The right to picket.
4. The right to the primary boycott.

Of the first, the United States Supreme Court in the Buck Stove & Range Case declared, "The right of laboring men to organize is no longer a question." Of the second, the same court in the Long Shore Printing Co. vs. Howell, said, "No Anti-Trust Act has ever denied to labor the right to organize or the right to a peaceable strike." Of the right to picket, Vol. 24 of the American Encyclopædia of Law, after an exhaustive review of all cases concerned, says, "Picketing without the use of force, violence, or intimidation, is lawful." Of the primary boycott, the United States Supreme Court in the Buck Stove & Range Case, said, "A primary boycott is lawful and will not be enjoined."

These, Gentlemen of the Decision, are the legitimate activities of Organized Labor and they have been upheld as such by the highest court of our land. Such eminent authority should place this issue above all question in your minds. The affirmative argue that Organized Labor should be exempted because these legitimate activities have been denied to the Labor Unions. To substantiate their claim they have cited you cases in Louisiana, California, and elsewhere where they assert such denial has occurred. Now, Honorable Judges, note this fact. In spite of the apparent inconsistencies in the

lower courts, there has never been a case that has resulted unjustly to Organized Labor in a lower court that has not been reversed in favor of labor by the higher Federal Courts upon appeal.

The affirmative argue further that the anti-trust laws destroy the means necessary for effective labor organization. Now, if the opposition have reference to those trade restraining devices, the sympathetic strike and the secondary boycott, which are used by Organized Labor to further its ends, we reply by saying that most assuredly the anti-trust laws deal very harshly with these unfair methods and rightly so. If conditions are so bad as the opposition picture, and Capital has really secured a strangle-hold upon Organized Labor to the extent that its legitimate interests are in jeopardy, then, Honorable Judges, let us be consistent, let us be sincere, let us place Capital back over the bounds that it has trespassed and punish it rather than exempt Organized Labor and thereby make two wrongs instead of one.

The opposition also contend that the operation of the anti-trust laws renders the activities of Organized Labor uncertain; that the Labor Unions do not know just what treatment will be accorded to them by the courts. Since their legitimate activities are guaranteed and without question, the negative will agree with the affirmative that Organized Labor is somewhat uneasy as to how it will get away with a restraint of trade in order that it might obtain a selfish end.

If Organized Labor is approaching a dissolution, as our friends of the affirmative declare, due to the opera-

tion of the anti-trust laws and conflicting court decisions, then the affirmative should be consistent in its position and ask for a federal law that will guarantee in unequivocal terms the right of organization.

This course, Honorable Judges, would be the logical treatment of the right to strike, picket, and the use of the primary boycott, but why doesn't Organized Labor advocate this? For the simple reason, Honorable Judges, that they know their legitimate activities are not jeopardized. Because of this inconsistency, the negative impeach the motives actuating Organized Labor in its demands for exemption as being sinister, deceptive, and selfish. Honorable Judges, Organized Labor is not suffering as the opposition infer. It represents the strongest organization in the United States outside of Capital. According to their own statement, the American Federation of Labor has over two and a quarter million members. According to their own testimony they have grown over a thousand per cent. since the enactment of the first anti-trust law. As to their efficiency, they took part in 603 strikes in 1914 and won 543 of them. After paying all expenses for that year, they had over \$91,000 left in their litigation fund alone. All this, Honorable Judges, under these very detrimental anti-trust laws that the affirmative contend are ruining Organized Labor. Such argument is little short of preposterous to say the least.

Secondly, Organized Labor should not be exempt from the anti-trust laws, because,

The peculiar differences between Organized Labor and Capital are not sufficient to justify exemption.

Upon this issue the affirmative dwell at length. They endeavor to point out some three or four reasons why it is unfair to catalog Labor Unions in the same class with Capital. In taking this position, they pose as being the friends of all labor, and picture to you two very remote extremes. On one hand they place Capital with all its dark array of selfish, avaricious tendencies. On the other, they feelingly place what they term "the poor, down-trodden laborer." Now, Honorable Judges, let us avoid sentimentality and hypocrisy in this matter. The affirmative are not the friends of all labor. They are only the friends of that highly specialized, heartless, grasping group known as Organized Labor. It is the scant ten per cent. of unionized labor that they wish to befriend. The other ninety per cent. of unorganized, deserving workers can starve so far as they are concerned. Gentlemen of the Decision, this is not the platform of the negative. We are in favor of a minimum wage, an eight hour day, prohibition of child labor, compensation insurance, etc., for all labor. It is the negative that would really render to labor in the mass a just and an equitable service. We would protect the horny-handed son of toil in all that is just, fair, and legitimate, but, Honorable Judges, when it comes to exempting him from law so that he, in conjunction with his fellow-workers in a powerful union, can and does block the legitimate channels of trade, we say, prosecute his union just as quickly as we would prosecute an offending corporation for a like crime. We admit that there is a vast difference in some respects between Organized Labor and

Capital, but by Scientific Economics they are fundamentally the same. They are both economic sources of production. They are alike in principle and practice. Then, is the solution of this matter the exemption of Labor Unions? Honorable Judges, no. The thing to do is to take the sensible and logical course which has already been taken. Protect these peculiar differences by suitable laws. Capital, at present, is protected and guaranteed certain privileges of procedure. Organized Labor is likewise protected and guaranteed all that is just and necessary to its welfare. Under such circumstances, the negative say, keep avaricious Capital where it belongs. Keep selfish Organized Labor where it belongs. Permit them to work in harmony for the good of the public, but exempt neither nor permit either to sidestep any bounds in a dangerous restraint of trade.

Not only this, but the affirmative argue that there is nothing fair or just in placing Organized Labor in the same class with Capital. Now, Honorable Judges, let us call your attention to the fact that we are debating "restraints of trade," not the legislation to regulate all the activities of either the Labor Unions or Capital. The Sherman Act was aimed at "restraint of trade," not at the evils of massed capital as the opposition would have you infer. Gompers wasted an entire issue of the *Federationist* to prove that the Sherman Act was aimed primarily and originally at Capital, but he deceitfully avoided the real truth all the way through. Senator Edmunds of Vermont, who really fostered the Sherman Act, said:

“The Sherman Law is intended to cover every form of combination that seeks to restrain trade, whether it be Capital through the form of trusts, or Organized Labor through the form of boycotting. Both are crimes and indictable under the Sherman Act.”

Because the law was virtually a dead letter upon the statute books for years, Gompers conceived the notion that it was never intended to apply to Organized Labor. Honorable Judges, the law was aimed at “restraint of trade,” and so effective have been its meshes in recent years that Organized Labor has felt its curbing influence and to-day it is desirous for exemption upon the flimsy excuse of being slightly different in composition from Capital.

Those differences that look so large to the affirmative were not sufficient in 1892 nor in 1914 to warrant such a prejudicial course of exemption. Neither are they sufficient to-day. We of the negative will admit that a law affecting all the possible contingencies in restraint of trade must needs be flexible in order to work in an equitable manner. Our anti-trust laws to-day possess this very feature since the rule of reason interpretation has been bestowed upon them by the United States Supreme Court. In view of this, it is evident that the differences existing between Organized Labor and Capital are not of a nature so fundamental as to warrant the exemption of Labor Unions. Lastly, Organized Labor should not be exempted from the anti-trust laws, because,

Such exemption would constitute an undemocratic class legislation.

Speaking of this, Senator Pomerene of Ohio said, "The legislation asked for is not in the interest of the laboring class as a whole. It is legislation in favor of a small part of labor as against all labor." Plainly, Honorable Judges, this is class legislation. The only way that the affirmative can meet this argument is by saying that such legislation exists at present and is recognized as being legitimate through the virtue of United States Supreme Court decision. Now, Honorable Judges, the negative will admit that many of our laws are based upon legal classifications. There is no theory that all laws must be static and universal in their application. For this very reason the anti-trust laws have been made flexible through the rule of reason, so as to be able adequately to fit every possible contingency that might arise in the extremes of either Organized Labor or Capital.

In the tariff law of 1909 and that of 1913, certain groups and organizations were exempted from the provisions of the corporation and income taxes. In the case of the Atchison R. R. vs. Matthews, the Supreme Court said, "The equal protection of the law does not forbid classification. This power has been upheld whenever such classification proceeds upon any difference which has a reasonable relation to the object sought for."

But, Honorable Judges, is the "object sought for" by Organized Labor parallel in its analogy to the exemptions under the corporation and income tax? Decidedly no. To say that such is true is but a clever deception couched in a play of words. It is not the question of a class legislation against Capital so much as it is a class legisla-

tion in favor of the powerful Labor Unions as against that great unorganized body of labor. Under exemption, the equal protection of the law would be violated by the organized minority against the unorganized majority. Organized Labor could then indiscriminately restrain trade, coerce employers, destroy property, and intimidate and abuse non-union workers just as long as it could justify the means by the pretense of the laudable intent of the end sought for.

But more than this, Honorable Judges. Not only would exemption be class legislation against unorganized labor, but it would also be class legislation against Capital. Lindley D. Clark, the economist, says, "The objects and methods of Organized Labor and Capital are so identical that the same legal principles must control."

Organized Labor and Capital are fundamentally alike. Both are factors in production. Both want a complete monopoly; one of labor, the other of the produced commodities.

In practice the two are identical. Both are striving to crush competition. One drives the independent company to the wall; the other assaults the scab with a brickbat. The union boycotts; the trust blacklists. The union has its pickets; the trust, its paid spies. Each limits output; each restricts membership. One fixes a minimum wage; the other fixes a minimum price. So identical are they that the absolute exemption of Labor Unions from all restraints would be in the words of President Wilson, "A class legislation of the most vicious sort."

Honorable Judges, Organized Labor is no longer a mere strike mob, clamoring for bread, as the affirmative infer. It is a powerful, aggressive, self-seeking organization. It has gone to school in Wall Street and is managed by men of intelligence, force, and ability. Its platform to-day is in the words of the leader, Samuel Gompers: "Claim everything; concede nothing; what outsiders think doesn't matter." So dangerous is this tendency to lawlessness, says Louis D. Brandeis, that great friend of labor, that, "Immunity of the Labor Unions from prosecution would tend to make their officers and members more lawless than ever."

In view of all this, the negative contend that justice can not be had by exempting Organized Labor and making it a class and a law to itself. Honorable Judges, there are no classifications granting immunity from criminal prosecutions. Thus, the negative rests the opening presentation of its case. I have proved to you:

First, that the present laws guarantee all the legitimate functions and activities of Organized Labor; second, that the peculiar differences between Organized Labor and Capital are not sufficient to justify exemption; and third, that such exemption would constitute an undemocratic class legislation.

SECOND NEGATIVE, JOHN P. HANTLA, SOUTHWESTERN
COLLEGE, '18

Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleague has proved to you three unescapable contentions in the negative of this question. In the further pre-

sentation of this case, we shall contend that Labor Unions should not be exempt from restraint of trade construction, because,

I. Capital and Organized Labor are so fundamentally alike that they are uniting against the public.

According to the affirmative, Organized Labor and Capital are two thoroughly antagonistic, irreconcilable factors in the field of production. Because of the war between them, the affirmative say that the exemption of Labor Unions from restraint of trade construction is imperative, in order that the labor trust can wage more decisively its combat against Capital. Now, Gentlemen of the Decision, we wish to reiterate to you that the negative stand squarely upon the proposition of justice and fairness to both Organized Labor and Capital. That there exists between these two a necessary and inevitable warfare in which those engaged should be permitted to inflict whatever injury they choose to do, we do deny. The only war-making power in our land is that of the national government. War between citizens is not to be tolerated. Organized Labor and Capital have no right to make war upon each other, nor teach that such a state of relations exist. Neither has the state a right to grant weapons to one class of citizens to be turned by them against another class. If one man has a gun and is seeking trouble, while the object of his wrath has none, why not disarm the man with the weapon rather than arm the other? And yet, Honorable Judges, the affirmative are urging exemption for Organized Labor in order that it might be armed against defenseless Capital

and the helpless public. The co-operation of Labor and Capital is necessary to production, and this shows that the proper relation between them is not war. True, occasional differences may arise. True, they may not always love each other. But they have to come to look upon each other as being economic necessities; counterparts of each other; without which neither can do anything. Contrary to what our friends of the opposition contend, there is a growing friendliness springing up between Organized Labor and Capital. While this friendliness does not take the form of an organization with officers and offices, yet it is evidenced in many places by practices pointing in this direction. These combinations exist for the mutual benefit of each other. Now the affirmative may try to meet this by saying that when Organized Labor combines with the employer, it is no longer a Labor Union but a form of Capital. Honorable Judges, how inconsistent is such a position! Just as logically could the negative say that Capital had disappeared while only a modified form of a Labor Union was in evidence. But this is only to quibble over the real issue. The fact still remains that the Labor Union in question is still a Labor Union just as much as ever, and also that it is one of the two equal parties to an agreement which has resulted in a restraint of trade which directly affects the general public.

There is evidence of such an organization or understanding between the Manufacturing Wood-workers' Association of New York and the unionized carpenters of that city. This association agrees to employ union

carpenters only on the condition that the Union will protect the association from all open shop competition by calling strikes on all buildings where open shop products are used. Through this combination no non-union woodwork, which is from twenty-five to fifty per cent. cheaper than union woodwork, can be used. The resulting facts are these: The builder is deterred from purchasing such material through fear of disastrous strikes. Monopoly and inflated prices are assured, while employer and employee divide the spoils. Under such circumstances the legitimate, free, and natural channels of commerce are blocked by an intangible combination of Organized Labor and Capital in a restraint of trade, with mutual gain for both.

Under these circumstances, how will the opposition execute justice? Where is the corporation upon which the courts can lay their hands in order that punishment might be meted out for such an insidious combination against the public? Honorable, Judges, there is none. Gentlemen of the Affirmative, how will you deal with such a situation? Under exemption you will have freed Organized Labor from prosecution for restraint of trade. You cannot prosecute Capital because you will have no proof of its being a party to the restraint, and yet the public will suffer all of its evil effects. Honorable Judges, there is only one answer to this dilemma. Deal with both parties as one. Mete out simple justice to both. Punish both when they concertedly restrain trade. If the proposed exemption were passed, Capital, which the affirmative admit is more crafty than the Labor

Unions, will hide behind intangible agreements with Organized Labor and have it execute Capital's wishes. Capital will grant the demands of Unionized Labor in return for certain restraints of trade against independent organizations of capital. Thus in exempting Organized Labor, we would find that we had also exempted massed Capital and all the restraints of trade would be legalized by the proposed measure.

That these very circumstances have existed, the affirmative cannot deny. It is a common fact of history, Honorable Judges, that the great teamsters' strike in Chicago was called by Cornelius Shea, the head of the Teamsters' Union, for \$1500. The toll of this reign of anarchy was over 800 criminal prosecutions for murders and slug-gings. Honorable Judges, the proposed exemption of Labor Unions will but legalize the possibility of such a recurrence. This is further attested by the fact that we do not prosecute either Labor or Capital for their friendly dealings with each other. The exemption would place a premium upon good will and mutual harmony between these two organizations in order that they could flagrantly restrain, through mutual co-operation, the legitimate channels of trade.

This combination is further attested by the facts discovered by the United States Supreme Court in the Danbury Hatters' Case. Thirty thousand dollars was spent annually in booming the sale of union label hats, and boycotting the sale of non-union hats. The union manufacturers, who were the beneficiaries of this system, relied on this far-reaching boycott to protect them from

all open-shop competition. In many instances they issued boycotting circulars and the union manufacturers used their salesmen in promulgating and furthering the boycott. Honorable Judges, with such practices doubtless being carried on at this very hour, justice for the American public cannot be had by separating Organized Labor and Capital with privileges for one when the tendency is to combine.

But more than this. In 1907 the West Virginia coal strike was inspired, if not financed, by the mine operators of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, who had made a compact with the Miners' Union to operate union mines on the condition that the operators would be protected from the West Virginia coal, which, at that time, was selling in those Lake States cheaper than the syndicate coal. To carry out this agreement, a strike was called by the head officers of unionism, to raise the price of the West Virginia coal up to the price of the Lake States' coal. Here, Honorable Judges, Capital and Organized Labor acted in concert to force unionism and labor prices. In doing so, the operators crippled their competitors and raised coal prices, the result of which was the threatened coal panic of 1907. Not until President Roosevelt took steps to seize the mines for the protection of the public, did that combination yield. Again we see, Honorable Judges, that exemption will but legalize such a procedure, while the prosecution of Organized Labor and Capital acting concertedly will be impossible because of the intangible agreement between the two. Manifestly we could not prosecute Capital when exempted Organized Labor was

restraining the trade, and all of the while massed Capital would be reaping every advantage against independent organizations that it desired. Under such circumstances, the negative say, let them combine in mutual harmony if they so desire, but if a restraint of trade is indulged in by either or both, prosecute them to the fullest extent of the law. This, Honorable Judges, is much more to be preferred, than to separate the two by the line of class privilege and have as a result a combination or agreement between the two that is as hidden and intangible as that of the Standard Oil Company and as hard to handle. Far better is it to make public the conditions in such agreements than to force Capital to hide its dealings in secrecy behind the back of legally exempted Organized Labor, and have the public pay the price with indiscriminate restraints of trade. No, Honorable Judges, we cannot afford to exempt Organized Labor from restraint of trade construction in anti-trust legislation.

The negative is further opposed to the proposed measure, because,

II. The concerted action of Labor Unions in the sympathetic strike and the secondary boycott causes a serious and menacing restraint of trade.

While it is obvious that we must have those laws that will make for a just and peaceable relationship between Organized Labor and Capital, it is also equally as true that the same law must guarantee protection to all the interests and welfare of the public. The reason for the negative opposition to exemption of Labor Unions from restraint of trade construction is because that under

exemption they could use the restraining devices of the Sympathetic Strike and the Secondary Boycott, in a deliberate coercion of the public in order to compel unwilling Capital to yield to its ever increasing demands. Honorable Judges, we have no objection whatever to offer as long as Organized Labor resorts to its legitimate activities to force Capital to come to just terms. We say, let labor organize; let the unions strike lawfully; use the peaceful picket; employ the primary boycott. As long as these actions are directed at the offending corporation alone, we say, use these legitimate activities. If they are endangered, as the opposition affirm, by conflicting court decisions, we say guarantee them by their incorporation into federal law. But, on the other hand, we say that when Organized Labor goes so far in its greedy, self-seeking demands as to employ the trade restraining devices of the Sympathetic Strike and the Secondary Boycott, then they must be held amenable to law. With these devices, they overstep their dealings with Capital and coerce the public into assisting them in forcing the employer, right or wrong, to accede to labor's wishes. The evidence will show that Organized Labor has done this very thing, and because they have been prosecuted for their unlawful workings, they are very anxious for exemption from this kind of construction. Note these undeniable instances.

In Danbury, Connecticut, D. E. Loewe had built up a thriving hat business. This industry is over eighty-two per cent. unionized, although Loewe's business was not. Yet, at that time, over one-half of his workers were

union men and all were fully satisfied with the conditions under which they were working. None of the employees wanted the shop unionized, but the highest court of unionism ordered it unionized. Loewe's objection was that if he unionized the shop, the union would not accept some of his oldest and most skilled workmen on a fair basis with the rest of the laborers. Just five days after he had stated his decision and objections the Secondary Boycotting machinery of the American Federation of Labor was turned upon him, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific his goods and retailers were boycotted and his business ruined. This case is known in the courts as the Danbury Hatters' Case. By this same method of the secondary boycott, the Hatters' Union had wrecked the business of Roeloffs & Co. of Philadelphia, just one week before they moved upon Loewe & Co. Now, Honorable Judges, plainly this action is a restraint of trade which cannot be justified. The United States Supreme Court in the Danbury Hatters' Case said, "The combination charged falls within the class of restraint of trade aimed at compelling the third parties (the public) not to engage in the course of trade except upon the conditions that the combine proposed." Such a charge, Gompers himself does not deny. He openly affirms that the American Federation of Labor purposes to use the Sympathetic Strike and the Secondary Boycott. Now, Honorable Judges, while the affirmative have dwelt at length upon the abuse of Organized Labor by the courts, bear this in mind: "No court could possibly exercise any more brutal, unfeeling, despotic power than Gompers

and his followers claim for themselves through an exemption which would permit them to carry on, without hindrance, every form and degree of the secondary boycott." Now note another specific case.

In June, 1913, the employees of all the ice companies of Cincinnati went out on a sympathetic strike. Selecting one of the hottest days of the year, they walked out when the inconvenience and suffering to the public would be the greatest, merely because one union had a grievance. Why did these affiliated workers strike? They had no grievance against their employers. Honorable Judges, they were forced to strike by the higher authorities of unionism in order effectually to tie up the necessities of life upon which the public depended. The evidence shows that the death rate was higher during that strike than at any other time in the city's history. Gentlemen of the Decision, it is to protect the public from such practices that the negative oppose the exemption of Organized Labor from the anti-trust laws. The moment Labor Unions go beyond their legitimate activities and resort to the use of the Sympathetic Strike and the Secondary Boycott, they not only interfere with the free course of commerce, but they coerce the public into aiding them in forcing a favorable issue. This procedure is nothing less than unreasonable restraint of trade, which is all that the anti-trust laws affect. These laws do not concern themselves with the Labor Unions so long as they restrict their operations to the adjustment of the relations between the offending employer and his employees. They apply only as the action of Organized

Labor interferes with the relation between the consumer and producer in a restraint of trade. In spite of all this, Honorable Judges, the affirmative purpose to exempt Organized Labor and turn the unions loose high-handed upon the defenceless public. They say that such exemption is necessary for the welfare of labor. Honorable Judges, this is not true. It is a class exemption in favor of that scant ten per cent. of well organized men who at present are drawing an average wage of \$3.85 per day as against that ninety per cent. of unorganized, deserving class that are drawing less than \$2.00 per day. The down-trodden laborers are the unorganized men and this class the affirmative have lost sight of completely. The negative oppose this unfair measure because it it is not just that 3,000,000 organized, selfish men be given the right to rule the remaining 29,000,000 of unorganized laborers, coerce the public, chastise capital, and dictate the labor policy of the country to the courts. The negative favor social legislation for all labor, but that all necessary reforms must come only through closed shop methods, we do deny. The railroads to-day are in the solid grasp of four powerful unions. What, Gentlemen of the Decision, is there under exemption to prevent a complete paralyzation of interstate commerce? Another Pullman or a teamsters' strike? Absolutely nothing. Lawlessness is lawlessness regardless of political, social, or financial standing of the offender. In the same way restraint of trade is restraint of trade regardless of trusts, labor unions, or combines. Fairness demands no privileges to either, but justice to all, and this, Honorable Judges, is

our grounds for opposing exemption. Yet in spite of all this, the affirmative would grant to Organized Labor exemption from the very laws that have heretofore restrained it and make it immune from prosecution. Gentlemen of the Decision, because you or I have never committed murder is no argument for exempting either of us from such a penal statute. Yet Organized Labor has violated the laws of restraint and purposes still to do so, hence the desire for exemption in order to avoid criminal punishment. Unless this was their object, they would not be so anxious for exemption. Let Labor Unions be lawful in their conduct and exemption is unnecessary. Even if Capital has violated the law in the past, and been ungenerous to labor in many instances, that is no excuse or justification for another wrong. The fact still remains that Organized Labor has restrained trade in the past through the use of the Sympathetic Strike and the Secondary Boycott. If the use of these unjust, unfair methods be legalized, we can only expect that the lawless dream of the Industrial Workers of the World will be realized.

With such an outlook as this before us, Honorable Judges, the negative rests its constructive presentation.

Since (1) the present laws guarantee the legitimate activities of Organized Labor; since (2) the differences between Organized Labor and Capital are not sufficient to justify exemption; since (3) such exemption would constitute vicious, undemocratic class legislation; since (4) Capital and Organized Labor are so identical that they are uniting against the public, and since (5) the

concerted action of the Labor Unions through the Sympathetic Strike and the Secondary Boycott results in serious trade restraint, therefore, the negative contend that in anti-trust legislation Labor Unions should not be exempt from restraint of trade construction.

NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, JOHN P. HANTLA, SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE, '18

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Let us note the workings of the sympathetic strike elsewhere. According to a member of the English Cabinet, England has made the sympathetic strike lawful, and her strikes have grown from 486 in 1906 to 1497 in 1913. The government of England granted everything that labor demanded, placed labor unions in a class by themselves, practically exempted them from law or punishment for any crime they might commit, went so far as to punish and restrict capital at the suggestion of labor, and to-day when the government of the people of England want labor, that is labor unions, to exhibit mere common patriotism and loyalty to country, they are flouted and laughed at and the political life of the country made subject to the whims and demands of the labor union leaders. Gentlemen of the affirmative, are the labor leaders of the United States of a different type or calibre than those in England? Are they more patriotic? Are they willing to subordinate themselves, their unions, their class, and their so-called consciousness of class to the demands of the whole country? Now, gentlemen of the affirmative, point out the difference between the unions

in the United States and those in England. Show us that their purpose and aims are different and why they would not employ the sympathetic strike when the privilege was given. (See February *Industrial 'Economist*.)

The arguments of the affirmative have resolved themselves into just this: Capital has restrained trade in its organization during the past by unlawful methods; capital and labor are counterparts of production. Therefore organized labor should be given by law the privileges that capital has unlawfully taken in the past. Honorable Judges, this is not the solution. Let Capital be set back in its bounds, and not unlawful privileges granted to labor unions. It makes very little difference so far as the public is concerned whether restraint of trade is by one group of citizens or another. The result is the same. Even a difference in aims, if such a difference existed, would not be sufficient to justify this abuse of the public. We grant that the methods of labor unions and capital are somewhat dissimilar, yet the purposes lying back of the unlawful workings are not dissimilar. A combination of capital against a business firm, or the turning of a secondary boycott against a firm, either if pursued will drive it to the wall. Honorable Judges, the affirmative have been able to recognize some fundamental differences between labor unions and capital that neither our law makers nor the Supreme Court of the United States have ever been able to discover.

We have taken the position for the uplift of labor regardless of the channel. There is no reason to believe that the sympathetic strike and the secondary boycott

will become virtuous so suddenly after such a dark past. Hence these unlawful activities cannot be argued for on these grounds. Churches are undoubtedly agencies for more good than unions, yet any man who would demand the organization of all the churches in America by coercion, or coerce all into joining them, would certainly have more zeal than judgment. Now the unions say that they are hindered in their activities by the law. We agree with them that they are hindered in such activities as we have described, and justly so. The power ought not to be given the unions to force the rest of labor to organize against its will into one great body of the American Federation of Labor. Nor ought the power to be given the unions to force the public to force unorganized labor to combine as the unions direct. Their zeal in the uplift of society surpasses their judgment. Uplift does not come by coercion. Their desire to uplift society is not second to their desire to establish themselves in a position that is impregnable. For, Honorable Judges, as they define society they are society. Even if their scope of society included all of labor the inconsistency is plain because of the small number of organized men.

Peter Roberts, International Secretary for the Y. M. C. A., says: "We can state without fear of contradiction that the high wage of industrial workers which prevailed twenty years ago has been reduced, while the wage of the unskilled worker has been raised." Honorable Judges, the labor unions have fought not one battle entirely outside their own ranks and yet their wage has fallen during the last twenty years among the industrial workers, which

are organized, and the wage of the unorganized man has been raised in this industry. There is but one conclusion: there are more powerful factors working for the uplift of the non-union man than there are for the union man. Let us note further. J. T. McCleary in the *American Iron and Steel Institute* says: "As is admitted even by critics, wages in the steel industry have raised twenty-five per cent. since the organization of the United States Steel Corporation." And the statement of T. P. Copping before a committee of the United States Senate: "I ascribe the increase in wages in the steel industry since 1900 more largely due to the efforts of the United States Steel Corporation than to the natural conditions of supply and demand." Gentlemen of the Decision, it has always been the policy of organized labor to limit apprentices to regulate the supply of labor. They have always contended that such methods kept the price of labor where it should be. Yet these men that I have just quoted have declared that another agency has been more beneficial in raising the price of labor than the labor unions. Can the affirmative point to any shop where the conditions are as good as in the factory owned by Henry Ford? It is obvious that the affirmative are mistaken in supposing that the unions need such dangerous weapons to demand the legal rights already granted them. Let us note further: Frederick M. Wharton says in the February *Industrial Economist*, "Laws for the benefit of labor in England were for the greater part originated with the employers who recognized the value of sane and effective regulations and the

health of employees." Hence it is seen that the uplift of labor does not depend on the unions nor their exemption from this construction, as the affirmative would have you believe. The negative say let uplift of labor come by whatever means it can be best secured, provided the means are lawful.

The affirmative question whether labor has a right to organize because some employers will not permit unions. Such a restraint in no way touches the right to organize. It touches the right of the individual to hire whom he pleases. The unions regard as their sacred right the privilege of working or refusing to work just as they may desire. And corresponding to and equally balancing this privilege is the right of the individual to hire whomever he pleases or fail to hire whomever he pleases. Such an attack on the legal right of labor to organize is not valid.

In spite of our constant affirmation of the legitimate activities of unions under the present laws, the affirmative have tried to make us assume that these rights are questioned by the present law. We base these legitimate activities of labor on court decisions. The law has never been consistently construed so as to deny the workers the right of combination into unions with their lawful rights, such as the peaceful strike, the peaceful picket, or the primary boycott. Note some of the cases: *The Longshore Printing Co. vs. Howell*: In this case in question, after holding that the strike of the printers' union would be enjoined because conducted with violence, the court said as follows: "But where a trade union seeks by fair

and peaceful means (including strikes) to compel an employer to observe one of its lawful rules, it cannot be enjoined therefrom." Also the "American Encyclopedia of Law," vol. 124, p. 829, says: "When not under contract the members of a labor union may unite in refusing to work." Page 835 of the same volume after an exhaustive review says: "Picketing, if done in a peaceful manner, without the use of force, violence, or intimidation, is lawful." And the unions are not denied the primary boycott, for we repeat the statement of the Court in the Buck Stove and Range Case, "A primary boycott is lawful and will not be enjoined." Also the *Wabash R. R. vs. Hannan*, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals by Judge Thayer, *Gompers vs. Buck Stove and Range Company*, *The National Protective Association vs. Cummings*, *Thomas vs. Cincinnati R. R. Company*, and "The American Encyclopedia of Law," all unite in giving labor a perfect freedom to organize. Thus, as we have already stated, the law recognizes four legal rights of labor: 1. To organize. 2. To strike peacefully. 3. To picket peacefully. 4. To use the primary boycott. These activities are so established by court decisions that there is no longer any question concerning their legality.

We have based our interpretation of unreasonable restraint of trade upon the Supreme Court decision in the *Standard Oil* case of 1909. We have referred to this decision this evening as the beginning of the rule of reason and we have defined unreasonable restraint of trade as that restraint of trade which is clearly and openly detrimental to the consuming public. This is both rea-

sonable and flexible and in no way uncertain. John R. Commons says in his book, "Labor and Administration," page 399, "The rule of reason is the noblest of all legal doctrines." The fact that the United States Supreme Court would sanction such a rule is indicative of its merit and genuine worth.

The opposition states that labor is not a commodity, and also admits that neither is capital a commodity. It is further conceded that both aim at monopoly. The gentlemen then attempt to show a fundamental difference between organized labor and capital by stating that organized labor is unlike capital because capital deals with a monopoly of commodities while labor deals with a monopoly of itself. Then the affirmative argue that the boycott is absolutely necessary for the effective maintenance of the unions. It is manifestly true, however, that the boycott must deal with commodities. Hence, according to the arguments of the affirmative, since labor is bound up with the principle of the boycott, it must also be inherently concerned with the commodities in whose distribution the boycott deals. Capital is merely concerned with commodities, then, labor and capital are fundamentally alike in their relation to commodities. The fundamental differences are merely a play on words.

SOUTHWESTERN BIBLIOGRAPHY

AUTHORITIES AND BOOKS CONSULTED

BY AFFIRMATIVE

Congressional Record for 1890, 1914, etc.

Reports of Committee on Industrial Relations.

The Modern Law of Labor Unions.—Martin.

Business a Profession.—Brandeis.

Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science.

American Federationist, for 1914, and May and Sept., 1915.

American Cyclopedia of Law and Procedure.

Pacific Reporter.

Outlook; World's Work; Literary Digest; Survey; Century; New Republic; Nation; Journal of Political Economy; Review of Reviews; Political Science Quarterly; Atlantic; Quarterly Journal of Economics, Feb., 1915; *Everybody's; Contemporary; Independent.*

A large number of Court Decisions.

Individuals: Wilson; Taft; Roosevelt; Lincoln; Holmes; McKenna; Field; Justice Furman of Okla.; Alton B. Parker; Cooley, the Sociologist; Seager; Ely; Commons; Jenks; Nearing; Gompers; John B. Andrews, Sec. of Am. Ass'n for Labor Legislation; Everett P. Wheeler, N. Y. Atty.; National Ass'n of Manufacturers; National Civic Federation; *Railway Age Gazette*; Brandeis; George M. Gillette; Senator Borah; Bouvier; Senator Sherman; Senator Hoar; Congressman Murray, of Okla.; Daniel Davenport, Counsel for Amer. Anti-Boycott Ass'n; Judge Anderson, of Ohio; Henry B. Martin, Counsel for Am. Anti-Trust League; Rep. Madison, of Kansas, now deceased; Rep. Thomson, of Okla.; Senator Thompson, of Kansas; Rep. Baily, of Pa.; Rep. Hill, of Ill.; Rep. Lewis, Md.; Basil M. Manley, of Ind.; Lyman Abbott; Wm. B. Wilson, Sec. of Com. and Labor; Frank P. Walsh; Judge Lindsey.

CITY MANAGER PLAN OF MUNICI-
PAL GOVERNMENT

I

CITY MANAGER PLAN OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

I

SOUTH DAKOTA WESLEYAN vs. MORNING-SIDE COLLEGE

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, BENJAMIN RINER, MORNING-SIDE COLLEGE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Municipal government in the United States is passing through a period of evolution. With each succeeding decade the work of a municipality has become more and more complex. One hundred years ago our municipalities had few public utilities and consequently the work of administration was comparatively simple. Since then our cities not only have increased in size, but the scope of administrative problems has rapidly developed. During this time municipal government has been changing in an attempt to handle these problems more efficiently. But it is a significant fact that the municipal government has not kept pace with the rapid development of municipal problems.

Following the old colonial municipal government there developed at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century

what is known as the Aldermanic plan. At first the mayor was a mere figurehead, but the trend of civic affairs has been to transfer more and more administrative power from the council to the mayor.

In 1900 Galveston originated the commission form of municipal government. The essential feature was the concentration of all corporate powers in a single elective body.

The latest development is the City Manager Plan, which is the proposition under discussion to-night. This plan has two outstanding features: first, all corporate power of the city is vested in a single body called the Council; second, this council employs a manager, from any part of the country, who is made responsible for the work of the executive department. He has the power to appoint and control all department heads and subordinates through a system of civil service regulation, with the possible exception of auditor and treasurer, who may be appointed by the council. If the voters desire they may exercise a check on this council through the initiative, referendum and recall. In turn the council has power to discharge the manager when necessary. This, gentlemen, is the latest step in the evolution of city government.

A city manager made his first appearance under the aldermanic plan in Staunton, Virginia, in 1908. This plan was applied to the commission form in Sumter, South Carolina, in 1912. Since then over ninety cities have adopted the manager plan.

Honorable judges, it has been mutually agreed before

this debate that we are to debate the fundamental principles of the manager plan. It has been further agreed that any isolated instances where the manager plan might not be easily applied, shall not be sufficient evidence to overthrow the contentions of the affirmative.

After a careful analysis of the question there are three issues upon which we believe the debate must center. First, Is a modification of municipal government necessary? Second, Are the principles underlying the manager plan sound? Third, Will the manager plan tend to remedy the defects of the present form?

Experience shows that a modification of city government is necessary, for our present forms are inadequate. The aldermanic form has proved itself inadequate to cope with our municipal problems. This is not surprising when we come to analyse the plan. One of the grave defects of the plan is a lack of concentration of power and fixation of responsibility. It consists of two irresponsible departments, the legislative and executive. For example, the newly elected street commissioner sees the need for paving a certain street, but he cannot proceed until authorized by the Council; if the Council favors the measure it is still subject to the mayor's veto. Who can the people hold responsible for the success of the job? The street commissioner, the council, or the mayor, when each can blame the other? Under this form of government for several years the suburb of Morningside petitioned the city for a pavement such as we now have, but in every case failed. On one occasion the mayor would blame the council, on another the coun-

cil would blame the mayor; and on a third some of the council would declare that the measure was defeated by log-rolling within the council. Finally the commission form was adopted and within a very few months the desired pavement was authorized by the council. Thus we see, when the diffusion of legislative responsibility was eliminated the desired results followed.

Gentlemen, what can we expect this plan to be except inadequate, when, in some of our cities, there are as many as eighty boards and committees with little intercommunication? This diffusion of responsibility, resulting in friction, log-rolling, and delay, is an inherent defect of the aldermanic form. How long would a private corporation run on such a basis as this? Efficiency is impossible unless you have centralization of authority.

Then again, we find that the executive department is inefficient. Although the principle of the single-headed executive is the strongest feature of the aldermanic plan, experience has demonstrated the fallacy of choosing city executives by popular vote. Some of our cities have ballots from two to four feet long, and it stands to reason that the average voter is not in a position to become personally acquainted with the candidates. Yet without this personal knowledge he cannot make a fair estimate of their ability. It is obvious that the voter is not in a position to choose competent executives.

Even if a good man is elected there is little incentive for him to become efficient, for he can have but a general knowledge of his new duties, and by the time he becomes familiar with his work a new election is at hand and he

must get out and electioneer. Consequently his duties are neglected. If he fails at re-election the municipality must suffer at the hands of another amateur. Gentlemen, this is the story of a large per cent. of our American cities. Shall we continue this factor in city government, which in its very nature makes it hard to secure good executives and offers so little incentive for them to become efficient?

Further, the aldermanic plan is inadequate because it is so susceptible to those corrupt influences which undermine the efficiency of city government. The executive department is especially crippled through this influence. Owing to the fact that the chief executive is elected, he is under obligation to appoint men of his constituency, regardless of their ability. On the other hand if these subordinates are elected they simply add to the length of the ballot, which makes it impossible for the voters to judge their executive ability. Thus, in either case, we have a group of inefficient subordinates in the executive department.

Again, this plan is easily infested with graft, for the diffusion of responsibility, false checks and balances, and committee systems tend to conceal and red-tape everything. Recent investigations show that Philadelphia had four boards ~~with~~ power to tear up the streets at will, but none to see that they were relaid; that Chicago had eight tax-levying bodies; that New York City had eighty different boards or individuals who have power to create debt. Gentlemen, is it any wonder that inefficiency and graft infest such a maze of boards, councils, and com-

mittees? The aldermanic plan lacks concentration of power; it lacks fixation of responsibility. There are inherent factors which in their very nature make this form inefficient, and therefore we contend it is inadequate.

The commission plan remedies one defect of the aldermanic form, because it provides for the concentration of power. But the commission plan swung to the other extreme and did not retain the best feature of the aldermanic form—the principle of the single-headed executive. Under the commission form we have a many-headed administration, each man having absolute power in his field of work. Thus, one department might be run at a profit, another at a loss. In Sioux City there is a surplus of thousands of dollars in the Waterworks department, but this cannot be used in the other departments which are scarcely able to make ends meet. This lack of coöperation is found not only in Sioux City, but is typical of the commission plan.

Each commissioner is primarily interested in the work of his department and since he helps to formulate the policies he must execute he often resorts to log-rolling to accomplish his ends. When San Diego, California, had this form of city government, this practice became so prevalent that the whole city government was temporarily demoralized, and they turned to the city manager plan as the one solution of their municipal problems.

Hence, with each department working as a unit, the best interests of the city as a whole are of secondary importance, and the inevitable result is friction, waste, and

log-rolling. The feature which the commission plan lacks is a single-headed executive to co-ordinate the various departments.

Further, gentlemen, the commission plan is founded on a dilemma; for in the selection of a council we find that it is natural for the people to select men who will represent them, while the plan itself demands that these commissioners have executive ability. Now the members of the employer class make better executives than the members of the employee class, for they have had more business experience. But if the commission is composed of the employer class, to the exclusion of the employee class, there will not be a representative body. While on the other hand if the employee class is represented in the council by one or more members it means that the departments over which they are placed must suffer, for these employees lack administrative experience. Thus the commission plan is founded on a dilemma which makes it impossible to secure the greatest efficiency in the executive department. Again this plan is inadequate because it is also susceptible to that political corruption which undermines efficiency. We must remember that these commissioners are elected and consequently are obligated to their constituency. They will and do cling to the spoils system.

Then the plan is easily infested with graft. To illustrate: the same men who levy taxes, assess property, and make the appropriations, spend the money; the same men who enact the laws, enforce them; the same body which makes the laws judges of their violation. With

such fusing of functions there is no check on the abuse of power.

Consider further, five commissioners or three composing a majority, with all the executive, legislative and judicial power of the city in their hands. Are they not in a position to do business in the political market on a large scale? Combine these with all the evil forces and you have a political machine which nothing short of a political revolution can break.

In conclusion, there are inherent features in the aldermanic plan which render it inefficient—it has two irresponsible bodies and a committee system which makes it clumsy, easily infested with graft and corruption. It is unbusinesslike.

True, the commission form did endeavor to remedy one of its defects, but the very nature of the commission form is defective, for it is also easily infested with graft. It is founded on a dilemma which provides for its own inefficiency. For these reasons we contend that a modification in city government is necessary.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, DON VAN HORNE,
MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE, '17.

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges: The first speaker has shown that a modification of the present forms of city government is necessary, for the aldermanic and commission forms are inadequate. He has stated the fundamental principles of the manager plan, which are, first, the concentration of all corporate powers in a single body, and second, the control of the executive depart-

ment vested in a manager who is appointed by the council on the basis of his efficiency. Now, it is my purpose to show that these principles, underlying the manager plan, are sound.

The first principle, the concentration of powers in a single body is sound, for it fixes responsibility. One of the great defects of the aldermanic form is the diffusion of powers and responsibility, but under the manager plan all corporate powers are vested in the council, which the voters hold responsible for the whole administration. There is no chance for the council to shift responsibility.

This principle of the concentration of powers is also successfully applied in business organization. All corporations have the ultimate power vested in a board of directors, elected by the stockholders. This board appoints a manager to take charge of the executive department, but the board remains responsible to the stockholders for the results obtained. What would be the result here if the stockholders elected two legislative bodies? What if they elected a system of independent committees to carry on the executive work? What if they elected an executive with veto power over the board of directors? How could efficiency be obtained with such diffusion of responsibility? Yet this is essentially what is done under the aldermanic form of government, for the mayor and council are independent of each other and there is no concentration of power in one body. This principle of the concentration of power has always been recognized in business organizations and its

successful application there is proof of its soundness. Furthermore, this principle of the concentration of powers is the basic merit of the commission form of government and it is recognized and retained in the manager plan.

Thus, gentlemen, we are proposing a plan with a principle which fixes responsibility, a principle which has worked successfully in the business organization, a principle which is the basic merit of the commission form, and which, in operation, has shown itself to be sound.

The second principle, that of the single-headed executive, is used in our school system. In this plan the voters elect a school board, which appoints a superintendent whom they hold responsible for the results obtained. Now we are not attempting to compare school work with city government. We simply wish to point out that the principle of the appointive single-headed executive has proved itself to be sound in our school systems.

Again, the principle of the single-headed executive is applied to business organization. All business corporations have a manager, appointed by the board of directors, and placed in full control of the executive department. What would happen if the stockholders elected a board of directors with each one taking charge of a separate department? Suppose one took charge of the purchasing department, another of the storage, another of the shipping. What diffusion of responsibility and inefficiency would result if there were no single-headed executive to co-ordinate the departments and secure harmony of operation? Yet this is just what is

done under the commission form of government, for each commissioner takes charge of a separate department and there is no single executive to secure harmony and to co-ordinate the different departments. Is it any wonder that the commission form fails to secure executive efficiency? The corporation, however, is the most efficient form of business organization, and the principle of the single-headed executive has always been recognized as indispensable to business practice. H. G. James, of the University of Texas, says that the soundness of the principle admits of no doubt.

The city is a cooperative corporation. While it does not produce profit it has for its aim the production of the domestic safety, health and comfort products, which demand the expenditure of time and energy. For their efficient production the most effective type of organization is demanded and the application of the principle of the single-headed executive gives this efficient organization. We do not wish to carry out a complete analogy between the corporation and city government, but we do maintain that the appointive single-headed executive and business methods should be applied to city government.

Furthermore, the principle of the single-headed executive is recognized to be one of the best features of the aldermanic plan and it is retained in the manager plan. Therefore, gentlemen, since the principle of the single-headed executive has shown its worth, in our school systems, and business organizations, and since it is the best feature of the aldermanic plan, we maintain that it is sound.

Moreover, the manager plan is in accord with the principle of representative government, for it gives true representation, and it is easily and effectively controlled.

It gives true representation without impairing the efficiency of the executive department. We have already shown that the commission form is based on a dilemma, for if the voters under this plan elect representative men, men of their own class, they are bound to get one or more members of the commission who have had no executive experience. When these men take charge of departments inefficiency is sure to result. On the other hand if they elect men of executive ability, true representation will not be secured, for the great employee class will not be represented, and will be out of touch with the city government. So in one case we cripple the executive department and in the other we fail to secure true representation. But it is a natural tendency for the voters to elect men of their own class even if they are inefficient. Railway switchmen, barbers, and laborers, who could earn perhaps \$700 a year, have been elected to positions that demand men of the type who could earn \$5,000 a year. This tendency makes the executive department of the commission plan inherently inefficient. But the manager plan remedies this. The council has only legislative functions; it does no administrative work. And, therefore, under the manager plan the voters can follow their natural tendencies and elect representative men and yet not impair the efficiency of the executive department.

Furthermore, the fact that the councilmen have only

legislative duties and do not have to give their whole time to the work or to details of administration, induces a better class of men to run for office. Public spirited men are willing to take offices under such an arrangement whereas before they would refuse to sacrifice their business by giving their whole time. This is the result of the plan in actual practice. H. S. Gilbertson, of the National Short Ballot League, says, "The type of men elected to the council of nearly every manager city has been materially improved."

Passing on to the next requisite of representative government, we find the manager plan responsive and easily controlled. The voters control the council as well as under the present forms. Besides control by direct election they may have the initiative, referendum, recall, if they so desire, for these can be applied to the manager plan, as well as to any other. It is often urged against the manager plan that it removes the manager from the direct control of the people, but, as a matter of fact, this plan gives even more effective control over the executive than before. The manager can be controlled by the council better than by the people. The council knows better than the people just what the manager is doing, for it gets its information direct while the people get theirs indirect. The council exerts constant supervision over him while the oversight of the people would be intermittent and unsatisfactory. The council holds over the manager the power of instant discharge. The best way, then, for the people to get a grip on the manager would be to send a group of representative men to the

council, and I have just pointed out that the manager plan gives the opportunity for this true representation. The manager is more responsive to the desires of a council, which holds over him the power of instant discharge, than a directly elected executive is to the prospect of recall or defeat at some distant election. Thus we see that the manager plan gives as effective control of the council as do present forms and the control of the executive is even more effective.

Furthermore, the manager plan abolishes one man power. Consider the situation under present forms. Under the aldermanic form the mayor is practically independent of restraint. The city is at the mercy of his whims and failings. He may disorganize the whole city administration and yet be practically impossible to dislodge. The commission plan remedies this somewhat, but even here each commissioner has a sphere of authority into which the commission as a whole cannot intrude. The election of a corrupt man as a mayor under the aldermanic form would demoralize a town; a corrupt man as commissioner under the commission form would demoralize one department; but his election as a councilman under the manager plan need do no harm whatever, since his notions are safely submerged and blended in the composite mind of the council, of which he is simply one voting member. On every question the final court of appeal is a single body; never a single and possibly opinionated mind. Even if elected manager he could do no harm, for the effective control which the voters exercise over the manager, through their representative council,

effectually prevents his becoming a political power. Furthermore, the council has the power to discharge him at any time. Thus it is apparent that the very nature of the manager plan is such as to do away with one man power.

In conclusion, gentlemen, the manager plan borrows the principle of the concentration of powers from the commission plan, a principle which fixes responsibility and which has been successfully used in business organization. From the aldermanic it takes the single-headed executive, a feature preeminently successful in our school systems and in business organization. The manager plan is in harmony with the principles of representative government as it gives the opportunity for true representation and it is easily and effectively controlled. It is a uniting of the best features of the present forms. Its underlying principles are not new, but principles whose application and operation have shown them to be sound.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, CHARLES W. GARLOCK,
MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have come to the third issue in this debate: Will the manager plan tend to remedy the defects in our present forms of government?

We have already pointed out that our present forms of government are grossly inefficient. It will be my purpose to show that the manager plan will result in increased efficiency, for it will diminish the corrupt influences which undermine good government, and further-

more there are inherent tendencies in the manager plan which make for efficiency.

The manager plan will diminish graft. We have already pointed out how graft in the aldermanic form of government is due to "red tape" and diffusion of responsibility. The commission form has endeavored to alleviate this condition by centralizing responsibility in the commission, but there is still opportunity for graft under the commission form because a single body exercises both legislative and executive functions of government. The same body that levies the tax and makes appropriations, spends the money. While under the manager plan two distinct bodies exercise the two functions of government. The Commission legislates and formulates policies; the manager and his staff execute them; the Commission makes appropriations; the executive department spends the money. Thus two distinct bodies exercising the two functions of government act as a check upon graft procedures. If any graft exists in the legislative department the Commission is at fault; if there is any corruption in the executive department, one individual—the Manager—is responsible. Under the Manager plan there is a greater centralization of responsibility which makes it possible to trace graft directly to its source.

The Manager plan will diminish corrupt influences, for it will tend to do away with the spoils system. Under this plan the commission chooses the manager on the basis of his ability to execute. They choose him from anywhere in the country, regardless of his political

affiliations, and hold him responsible for the executive department. It is significant that the majority of the managers have been chosen from other towns, showing clearly that the commission wanted a manager that would be free from local politics. Now the fact that the manager is appointed because of his efficiency rather than elected by a political machine is a most commendable feature of the manager plan; for under those circumstances the manager is not obligated to play the political game. He has no political supporters with whom to divide the spoils; he has no henchmen to repay by appointing them to office; he has no political boss over him to dictate his appointments, but is free to choose competent men and to organize the executive department along the lines of business efficiency. The Manager Plan provides for an efficient organization, for it tends to divorce the executive department from politics and to do away with the spoils system which is such a fruitful source of inefficiency.

In addition to the alleviation of those evil influences there are inherent tendencies in the Manager Plan which make for efficiency. The practice of appointing the chief executive tends toward efficiency, for he is chosen on the basis of his competency. Under the Manager Plan the Commission is in a position to investigate the reputation of the manager, they are favorably situated to scrutinize his records and qualifications. They are held directly responsible by the people for the entire administration. Therefore, it is only natural that they would choose a capable man. This responsibility is cen-

tered on the Commission which gives them a great incentive to make a wise choice.

We all realize that this is an age of specialization. Then why should we not have trained men in the sphere of municipal management as in any other field? The Manager Plan promotes such specialization and would create a class of executive experts. It has developed to such an extent that several universities are offering courses in municipal management. Men are choosing this as a profession. In devoting their lives to this work is it not reasonable to believe that they would take pride in their chosen profession? If a manager is displaced or outgrows his town he can proceed to another where his previous experience can be used to a great advantage. Mr. Ashburner, who was manager at Staunton, Virginia, for six years, has aspired to a managership in Springfield, Ohio. Mr. Carr, former manager at Cadillac, holds a similar position at Niagara Falls, New York. When executives can look forward to similar positions elsewhere it gives them great incentives toward the development of personal efficiency. Also the fact that they can be discharged at any time gives them great inducements to do their best, for they realize the consequences should they become negligent. Under such conditions managers have every incentive to become efficient. They realize that their position depends upon results and that advancement in their profession depends upon their past records. These tendencies do not exist in any of the older forms of municipal government, but are inherent and essential to the Manager Plan. The very

nature of this whole organization tends towards efficiency, for the commission is in a position to choose a capable manager and the manager has powerful incentives to become an expert and to produce economical results.

Now let us see what the plan has accomplished in actual operation. The following figures are taken from the official records of the various cities. In 1914 when Springfield, Ohio, adopted the Manager Plan the city was on the verge of bankruptcy. Sixty per cent. of its taxes were devoted to the payment of debts while only forty per cent. was left for running expenses. During the first fourteen months the city reduced its floating debt one hundred thousand dollars, reduced the running expenses fifty-two thousand dollars and at the same time gave additional services. The final result is that taxes have been reduced from fifteen mills in 1914 to thirteen and one-tenth mills in 1916. Jackson, Michigan, during the first year of the Manager Plan decreased the net indebtedness \$50,000, gave \$10,000 worth of additional services and had on hand a cash balance of \$10,000 exclusive of sinking fund. This was accomplished without a raise in taxation.

Montrose, Colorado, after increasing the services rendered, saved \$13,000 out of a \$40,000 budget. As a result of these savings the tax levy was reduced from eight and one-half to seven mills. George O. Gilbert, cashier of the Montrose National Bank, says: "The Manager Plan in Montrose has within ten months resulted in the largest bank balance in the history of the city. There are large reductions in the taxes for next

year. At the same time the city's activities are being extended rather than reduced. While I did not vote for the Commission Manager form of government yet I am well pleased with its results."

Iowa Falls has made such large savings that they have reduced the tax levy ten mills. In Morris, Minnesota, the Manager Plan has proved sixteen per cent. more efficient than the previous administration. Lewis C. Spooner, representative in the legislature, says, "The change of this city to a Commission form of government with a manager has worked out fine. I am, as I suppose, the largest tax payer in the city. I like the management of our city affairs because it is more efficient, more economical, less political, and in every way to a business man, more satisfactory." This is the attitude of business men who have seen the plan in actual operation.

Even the village of Hickory, South Carolina, after increasing the scope of its activities, saved \$13,000 the first year, and \$17,000 the second year without a raise in taxation. These examples testify as to the merits of the Manager Plan, for they are direct comparisons between the older forms of government and the Manager Plan operating in the same cities under the same conditions.

Cadillac, Michigan, cut running expenses thirteen per cent., and in Taylor, Texas, the Manager plan has proved fifteen per cent. more efficient than the previous form of government.

In Le Grande, Oregon, the manager found the city bankrupt with outstanding warrants to the amount of \$10,000 which the banks refused to accept under any

consideration. By applying efficient methods he was able to pay off \$35,000 the first year and another \$35,000 the first four months of 1916, with no decrease in services rendered. Gentlemen, these are the results of placing city government on a business basis.

This plan has been adopted in Dayton, Ohio, with equal success. In 1913 under the Aldermanic form of government Dayton issued bonds for street repairs and lighting, while under the Manager Plan in 1914 no bond issue was necessary and the city was given additional services to the amount of \$139,000. They also paid \$50,000 on a debt which had been accumulated under the previous administration. Dayton has also reduced her taxation and made additional progress during the past year. Henry J. Allen, secretary of Governor Stanley, says, "Dayton in the first eighteen months of the new system decreased her debts \$71,045 and increased her assets \$407,324, without increasing her taxation. She has, in addition to these financial advantages, doubled her public service without increasing her budget over that in vogue under the old system." Was this not accomplished by increasing the purchasing power of the dollar? Does this not show that the Manager Plan tends toward efficiency? These are not exceptional cases, but they are taken from all parts of the country, and if time permitted we could give similar reports from towns located in twenty-three different states where the plan is operating successfully under varying conditions. But let it suffice to say that wherever the Manager Plan has been given a fair trial it has resulted in the establishment of

purchasing departments that buy all of the city's supplies in large quantities, thus standardizing tools and doing away with unnecessary duplication. It has introduced scientific financial systems. It has increased health and fire protection, and has reorganized each department along the lines of business efficiency.

However, we do not claim that the Manager Plan is perfect, nor do we maintain that it is a panacea for all existing evils in the present system, but we do contend that it is an advance over other systems of government now in vogue. It is the uniting of their best features. It has incorporated in it principles which have proved themselves worthy of merit, and is but another step in the direction that municipal affairs have trended for the past century. Municipalities are not launching out in a new direction in the adoption of this plan, but are just entering another stage in the evolution of Municipal Government.

*ST. OLAF COLLEGE vs. MORNINGSIDE
COLLEGE*

FIRST NEGATIVE, G. IRVING BACK, MORNINGSIDE, '18

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The question for debate to-night has been stated: Resolved that the city manager plan of government should be adopted by American municipalities. It may be well before proceeding further to get a clear meaning of the word municipality. A short definition from Bouvier's law dictionary says. that a municipality is a public corporation

created by government, for political purposes. Or in other words a municipality is any incorporated town or city. Thus it is evident that the question includes all classes of cities and towns in the United States, ranging in population from a few hundreds to the millions.

We wish it understood at the outset that no one deplores the evils and abuses that are present in many of our American cities any more than do the negative. The negative do not defend the abuses of our present city organizations. We believe that far reaching reforms must be instituted before we can enjoy municipal success. In our discussion, we shall not necessarily uphold any one form of government for the vast majority of cities, but simply maintain that the city manager plan is not the one system to be adopted by all classes of municipalities in the United States.

Now, in order to support their proposition, the burden of proof lies with the affirmative in conclusively establishing the following issues:

First, they must show that the present forms of government are inadequate and that a change in charter is necessary. In order to do this they must show that just as good government is not, and cannot, be had under our present forms as can be had under the manager form. They must also show that those evils which they accredit to the present forms of government are due to something peculiar or to some inherent defect in our present charters.

Second, they must show that these evils which they have pointed out in the present systems will be alleviated

under the manager form. We contend that it is not enough for them to show that there are more evils in our present forms of government, but since they have deplored these evils they necessarily assume the burden of showing just wherein the plan which they propose will cause these evils to be substantially less in number and in magnitude.

Third, they must demonstrate that their plan can be applied to all classes of cities. In doing this they must demonstrate sufficient flexibility for its general adoption in our smallest class of cities, as well as in the metropolis, and in the large middle class of cities.

Fourth, we contend that it will be necessary for them to show that expert managers could be secured for all cities and towns in the United States. Not only must they show that they can be secured, but that there is a demand for the expert services in the small class of cities below 2,000 population, as well as the larger classes.

Fifth and lastly, we contend that it is vital for the support of their proposition to show that the results claimed for the manager plan are due to something peculiar to that system. It is not enough for the affirmative to show economies; they must analyze them and show the manager's part in securing them. In this way it will be incumbent upon the affirmative to show that these results are not due to an increased civic interest, scientific accounting systems, unified purchasing departments, and increased revenue. These benefits are not peculiarly inherent in the manager plan but can be

had and are being had under our present systems to-day. These issues we believe must be met by the affirmative, before they can establish their case.

On the other hand, if we of the negative can show that the city manager plan is unsound in principle and consequently inefficient in operation, or, that it will not remedy the evils of our present systems, or, that there is no need for the adoption of a new plan, we have established our case.

Before discussing the principles of this plan I would like to point out the fact that affirmative advocates have laid undue emphasis on the matter of mere form of government. We do not deny that certain evils exist in our American cities to-day. Again, since these evils are present we agree with the affirmative that steps should be taken to remedy them. To correct these abuses our opponents advocate a sweeping change in the form of municipal government affecting the vast majority of cities in the United States. We agree with James Bryce, in his book on the American Commonwealth, when he says, "In the development of a stronger sense of civic duty rather than in form of government, lies the ultimate hope of municipal reform." Now, gentlemen, our contention is that the mere substituting of another form of government, with the same powerful forces working against it that are now influencing our present systems, would not only fail to remedy present evils, since the causes would not be removed, but would result in greater evils. And why?—because of the very principle of the proposed plan.

The city manager plan is unsound in principle. Let us analyze the workings of this plan. Here we have a council or commission whose duty it is to outline the policies. This council is elected by the people. On the other hand, another step removed, is the manager. He is not directly responsible to the people over whom he is chief administrator, but subject only to dismissal by the council which appoints him. This indirectness of responsibility is the first step in violation of American principles of democracy, because the tendency of late in all forms of American government has been that of trusting more and more power to the discretion of the whole body of common people. To illustrate, when the constitution was adopted, it was considered that the best way to nominate the president of the United States, was not to have the whole body of people vote, but to have a convention meet and find out by some means who was the best man to become president of the United States. The idea was that the people could not be trusted to do that work. But what have we now? The direct primaries for the nomination of president in thirty-two states of the Union, where every man casts his vote for the candidate directly. Practically the same thing was true in the election of the United States Senators. But now as Hon. Dudley Foulke, President of the National Municipal League, says, 'The people of the United States have now determined by constitutional amendment that it is far better for the people to choose by direct election ~~than~~ by this indirect method, which confuses and obscures the issues, making mere dummies of the men com-

posing them." This would be the result in cities still subject to boss control. Even in municipal government we have seen the rapid spread of the initiative, referendum, and recall, showing the demand of the people in its present tendency for more direct control. So then, the appointing of a city manager is a backward step since it is not in accord with present tendencies in all forms of American government.

Again the fundamental principles of the plan, namely the appointing and removing of the manager at the will of the council, is not only a backward step, but it is a step that provides for its own inefficiency. It defeats the very purpose its advocates claim for it. Now it is obvious that all the representative men whom the affirmative would elect upon this council, cannot be experts. Consequently, their limited knowledge will prevent them from seeing the affairs of the municipality in the same light that the expert manager does. If the manager in a difference of opinion insists upon what he knows to be the correct method of procedure, he will do it at the expense of his position, because the council has full power to discharge him at any time. On the other hand if he submits to the policy of the council his expert knowledge will be of no value to him and the municipality is simply paying an expert his expert's wages without adequate returns. Is it not reasonable to suppose that this manager will at all times abide by the policies of the council whether they be good, bad, or indifferent, regardless of his own judgment, when he knows that his tenure of office lies in their hands? When these principles are

applied will they tend to make for efficiency when this expert is entirely subservient to the wishes of a common representative council? If this manager thus virtually becomes the creature of the council, where is the efficiency of the plan?

As to the length of time and number of cities which have adopted this plan, it is still but an experiment. Therefore, it is reasonable to say that the results obtained so far in the adoption of the plan cannot be taken as conclusive, since the interest of the people is always at its highest pitch when a new plan is being tried out. Nevertheless, in spite of this there are a few things coming to light already which point to its unsoundness in principle and which deserve our attention. In Sumter, South Carolina, the very town that inspired most of the other towns to adopt this plan, the manager was dictated to by the council and finally resigned because of his lack of delegated power and initiative. Sumter was without a manager for over a year. Manager Hardin, of Amarillo, Texas, in a personal letter says, "My commission has had its pets and has put them over me and they are useless." In Phoenix, Arizona, the commission attempted to compel the manager to retain certain inefficient employees. The manager refused and was removed. The *Municipal Journal* for September, 1915, says, "The Manager of Beaufort, South Carolina, has been dismissed by the council because it objected to his methods of collecting back taxes." We have any number of personal letters in our possession revealing just such petty quarrels, which we might read if time permitted. Thus, we see that after

this comparative short existence of the manager plan, its unsoundness in principle is being made manifest. Do these results point toward an efficient government managed by an expert?

As to the smaller classes of municipalities below 2,000 population, we ask the affirmative to show that there is need for an expert's services in this class. Mr. Robertson, the second manager of Sumter, South Carolina, left them over a year ago, because there was nothing for an expert to do. Now, gentlemen, if this was true in a town of 8,000 population, what can we expect of that great class of cities less than 8,000? A reply to a personal letter to the city manager of Lakeland, Florida, says that the manager form is not a success in a town of 7,500 because the results obtained do not justify the salary of the expert.

With reference to the great middle class of cities, a few of which have adopted this plan, it will be shown by the second speaker, how this plan will be more susceptible to evil influences than our present systems.

[Now let us attempt to apply a plan with such principles as these to one of our larger cities. Since there is no one of the class of cities above 200,000 population which has this plan, we may imagine putting it into operation at the present time in Chicago for instance. As you know, Mayor Thompson recently began enforcing the Sunday closing law. Now just what would a manager be up against if he were in Thompson's place? First he would be appointed by the council and subject to discharge at any time without cause. It would be his

duty to enforce the law, but he must also do as the majority of the council directs. Now gentlemen, two-thirds of the councilmen in Chicago have openly opposed the efforts of Mayor Thompson, but inasmuch as he is an elective officer and not appointed he still retains his office, although he enforces the laws in opposition to the wishes of the council. But what would happen if he were a manager? He would do as the majority of the council directed or he would be discharged—discharged because of efficiency. In either case the system would work out inefficiently. This is just one of the many propositions which we might cite to show wherein this plan would work thus, because of its very principle. This is not an exceptional case but simply a fair application of the plan in a class of cities where it has not yet been tried.

Therefore, gentlemen, since this plan is a backward step, because it is not in accord with present tendencies in all forms of American government, since the inherent principles of the plan provide for its own inefficiency, and since its very principles prohibit its general successful adoption, we maintain that the city manager plan should not be generally adopted by American Municipalities.

SECOND NEGATIVE, WILLIS FORBES, MORNINGSIDES
COLLEGE, '18

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: Thus far in this debate the negative has shown that the manager plan is fundamentally wrong in prin-

ciple because it creates a high-salaried official who is powerless to act independently, and because it would inevitably result in a clash between the manager and the elective body. I will show that the manager plan, if adopted, would result in less efficient government than we have to-day.

The first speaker on the affirmative has called your attention to the woeful inefficiency of present forms of government. In doing so he has emphasized two of the most prominent causes for inefficiency, namely, political machines and graft. I will show that the manager plan would result in less efficient government than we have to-day because it would increase these evils which have already been pointed out and recognized by the affirmative.

Let us first consider the evil of political machines. Would it be remedied by the adoption of the manager plan or would it be increased? W. D. Bliss, in his "Encyclopedia of Social Reforms," says, "The concentration of power develops rings, bosses and machines." The concentration of appointive power then which makes possible the effective use of the Spoils System is the prime essential to the establishment of a political machine. The manager plan would increase this evil because it would increase the concentration of appointive power. When this plan was first formulated it was intended to concentrate all appointive power in the manager and thus to remove city executives from politics. But, gentlemen, these intentions have gone wildly astray. It was overlooked for the moment that the manager would become a creature and tool, controlled body and

soul by the elective council. That body appoints the manager and has complete control over his tenure of office. It can remove him at any time he refuses to obey its dictates. Thus all appointive power is concentrated in the commission. It has been demonstrated by experience that wherever this plan has been adopted the councils have insisted upon controlling appointments and upon dictating details of administration.

Let me cite several instances where this has occurred under the manager plan. In Phoenix, Arizona, the commission removed their first manager because he refused to play politics and to distribute public offices as it desired. Manager Hardin, of Amarillo, Texas, says in a personal letter to our team, that his commission has forced its pets upon him and that they are absolutely useless as city officials. In Sandusky, Ohio, the manager resigned one month after his appointment because the council insisted upon appointing even his private secretary. E. I. Reardon, Secretary of the Sumter Chamber of Commerce, in a personal letter, says as follows: "Our manager had no voice in the appointment of city officials and employees. He was interfered with by the commission and he told me so himself. That is, he didn't have any power of initiative or control in anything at all. He was subject to the orders of the city council and had no power to do anything without first consulting its members." It is a significant fact that Sumter has had no city manager for two years. These instances are not exceptional cases caused by defective charters, as the affirmative may claim, because the

charters of those cities are of the most improved manager type. These instances show how the complete power of appointment and executive administration is exercised by the commission. Thus, the manager plan offers a clean sweep for a political machine when it once intrenches itself in office. Do not forget that the political machines will still be in the race and just as soon as the excitement over the adoption of a new form of government has died down the people will resume that same old indifference toward public affairs that they have always maintained heretofore. Then the cities' affairs will again be turned over to the ravages of the professional politicians, who will continue to put their men into office by their usual dishonest and under-handed methods. Picture to yourself the enormous political pie which would then be at the disposal of the machine. Scores of public offices would go as political plums to men who had helped the machine in its campaign. We would then have an ideal political machine. Every city employee from department head down to street-sweeper would become an agent of the administration to maintain it in office by any means whatsoever. Thus, the manager plan would most certainly result in the establishment of compact and legally sanctioned political machines, far more powerful than any ever dreamed of under present forms of government. Hence the manager plan would be less efficient than present forms of government.

The second of these evils, that of graft, would be increased by the manager plan because it would increase the opportunities for graft.

The most prolific source of graft in city government to-day is in the awarding of contracts for public work. Contractors are only too glad to make a handsome gift to city officials who award the city contracts. This practice is prevalent all over the country. In fact politicians consider this the greatest incentive to seek office. It does not matter if the work done is not up to standards nor if the prices paid are exorbitant. The prime consideration of the average politician is the personal graft money he secures from the contractor.

Will the manager plan remedy this situation? No! Instead of decreasing this power of awarding contracts corruptly, the manager plan increases it. In delegating the administrative work to the manager, the affirmative would have him award all contracts, determine all specifications, and accept all work. Now, Honorable Judges, if this is the case there is an enormous opportunity for the administrative department to secure graft money on public work. But this is not the case, the ultimate power lies in the hands of the Council which controls the Manager body and soul. This body also controls all publicity and issues all reports to the people. Thus, while the public is watching the Manager, the Council is working in obscurity, and the responsibility for administrative acts cannot be definitely located. In this way the opportunities for graft under the Manager plan are far greater than those existing under present forms of government.

Let me cite just two instances where these opportunities have been greedily accepted by the politicians under

the Manager plan. According to A. M. Holden, Secretary of the Bureau of Municipal Research of Harvard University, in the October issue of the *National Municipal Review*, page 585, in Jackson, Mich.—a city in which graft was almost unheard of prior to the adoption of the Manager plan—one of the Councilmen recently made public charges against his fellow-councilmen, showing that practically every one of them had been participating in public contracts for private profit, and that the private gain thereby had been enormous. In Springfield, Ohio, also under the Manager plan, the State Board of Municipal Accounting recently disclosed certain items in the Water-works department which pointed undeniably toward graft.

These are only two of the instances of graft which have been uncovered in cities having the manager form of government. Friends of the manager plan are prone to attempt a defence on this point by saying that few instances can be cited to show that this has actually occurred. But bear in mind that this plan has been in operation but a comparatively short time, and that graft, corruption, and the operation of political machines are not discovered in a day. At the present time the manager plan is apt to be at its apex of efficiency because it is a political revolution supported, in some cases, by an aroused public interest. Considerable time may pass under the manager plan before this seemingly smooth surface of city affairs is drawn back and the graft and corruption which is really hidden there is laid open to the public eye. But rest assured that under such a system

of government as the affirmative propose to-night, with all of its concentration of appointive power and its increased opportunities for graft, it is inevitable that graft and corruption will creep in to a far greater degree than they have under the older forms of government.

I have shown that the manager plan would result in less efficient government than we have to-day because it would increase the evils of political machines and graft, which are the foremost causes of inefficiency and which the affirmative deplore in present city government. Thus we contend that the adoption of the manager plan would be a dangerous step for American municipalities.

THIRD NEGATIVE, JOHN V. MADISON, MORNINGSIDES
COLLEGE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Taking up the third issue of this debate—Is a change in Charter necessary?—we wish to call your attention to a portion of the burden of proof which still rests with the affirmative, namely to show—first, that the present forms of government are inadequate and that a change in charter is necessary to secure good administration and, second, that the results which they claim are due to something that is peculiar to the manager plan. The negative contend that a change in charter is not necessary, for good government is not dependent upon charter form.

In developing our argument we shall follow two main lines of reasoning—that the benefits claimed do not warrant a charter change, and that good government can be had under the present charter forms.

The results claimed do not warrant a charter change because they are based upon an extremely unfair comparison. The affirmative have quoted the vast savings that have been effected in cities where this plan has been adopted. The figures for the basis of comparison are usually taken from the last year of the administration under the old form of government and the first year under the new form. This is obviously unfair. Before there is sufficient agitation and sentiment to cause a change in charter, municipal government must be extremely corrupt or extremely antique, either of which renders it highly inefficient. On the other hand, when the change is made, the new régime is looked upon as a revolution—a reform movement. Public interest, a very important factor in good government, is aroused to a very high pitch; politics are temporarily disarranged; and the new government assumes its duties without handicap, determined and inspired to reach the highest efficiency. Thus the comparison that we have given is of the administration of the manager at its very highest efficiency, and of other forms at their very lowest, which is manifestly unfair.

That is to be borne in mind when considering all the matters which the affirmative are introducing as evidence where their plan has just been adopted. Every concomitant condition is favorable for its success. Their plan of government is now at the apex of its efficiency. The question is not so much, is it now efficient, but will it remain so when the whip of aroused public interest ceases to threaten?

Then, again, the results claimed do not warrant a charter change, because they are not due to anything that is peculiar to the manager system. As we examine reports from the various manager governed cities we find other chief causes for economy. Among them are: modern accounting systems; purchasing departments, by which supplies are standardized and purchased in large quantities. The purchasing department was the chief source of Dayton's big saving, netting an economy of \$33,000 in one year's operation. But purchasing departments and accounting systems are not dependent upon the manager form of government. Many cities have these advantages which are not encumbered with a manager.

The amount of the economies is usually figured from the difference in cash balances at the end of the two fiscal years. Another very obvious sort of so-called economy, then, is an increase in revenue. Amarillo, Texas, is frequently referred to as an example of the efficiency of the manager form of government. It has been but two years since Amarillo adopted the plan. In this time taxes have increased thirty-five cents on a hundred dollars simply because additional revenue was needed. Furthermore, there were \$29,000 of outstanding back taxes, most of which have been collected under this new administration to increase the revenue. Evidently it does not require a municipal expert, to conduct the affairs of a city in this manner, but rather an official who dares to enforce the law. Their manager, instead of being an expert, was a former clerk in the district

court, and confesses to have known nothing about municipal affairs previous to his appointment.

Another form of economy much lauded by the advocates of this plan is illustrated by the figures on the paving contract of Fredericksburg, Virginia. The paving was to have cost \$9,000, but just as the contract was to be let, the new manager was appointed. Coincident with the coming of the manager some one discovered sand on property belonging to the city. This sand was substituted for the gravel which was to have been bought and the city saved \$6,500 by this substitution—all of which is usually attributed to the efficiency of the manager, who had nothing to do with the finding of the sand.

Still another character of saving is illustrated by the famous sewer case of Manistee, Michigan, whereby Mr. Charles E. Ruger is reputed to have saved the city \$78,000 by preventing the letting of the contract to rebuild a sewer system that needed only to be cleansed. Manifestly the thing that Manistee needed to do was to call in an engineer for a month and let him go again. Just to show you that this is not an unheard of practice, I will have you note that when Springfield, Ohio, wished to install her new accounting system, despite the presence of Mr. C. E. Ashburner as expert manager, they called in accounting experts from New York City to install the system for them. Likewise when Dayton, Ohio, wished to improve her garbage removal, sewage disposal, and water works system, experts were called from New York to do the work in an efficient manner, for which efficiency

Mr. Waite, as manager, receives the credit. When Montrose, Colorado, wished to build her new water-works they called Burns and McDonald, consulting engineers of Kansas City, to plan it for them, despite the presence of Mr. P. W. Pinkerton, as city manager. Such a practice as this is but the reduction of the manager from his hypothetical position of expert executive to an information bureau to report where experts may be found.

If time permitted we might thus analyze the savings in any city that has this manager plan of government, and find that the economies proclaimed are due to either a reform movement or to some executive machinery in no wise dependent upon the manager form of government.

Modern accounting systems and purchasing departments are not peculiar to manager governed cities. The results claimed in all cases cited have nothing to do with the expertness or efficiency of the manager and therefore do not warrant a change in charter.

Our second contention is that the change is unnecessary, for corresponding results can be and are obtained under present charter forms. The chief difference is that the economies when effected are not publicized because the cities are not in that limelight usually cast about the city adopting the manager plan. St. Louis has a sewer case which corresponds very closely to that of Manistee, the chief difference being that St. Louis called in an engineer for a month rather than a manager for all time. But the latter case is not as well known as the former because publicity has been denied.

Again, where there is efficiency under the old forms of government, there is not the same chance for comparison as there is under the manager plan. Government has been efficient for a period of years and there is no inefficiency with which to contrast it.

Let us call your attention to a few of these efficiently governed cities. Alta, Iowa, is a small village with a population of one thousand two hundred, which is very efficiently administered. Just recently Alta paid off a bonded indebtedness of \$6,200. The city owns its water-works, heat and light plants, and is run at a minimum of expenditure. Fargo, North Dakota, recently reduced its operating expenses sufficiently to enable the mayor to do the novel thing of declaring a six per cent. dividend to all tax payers whereby he gave back to them \$10,000. Austin, Texas, has 3.6 miles of electric lights which were installed upon its streets and are now operated at the expense of the water-works department, which was so efficiently administered that it bore this increased expenditure with no indebtedness. The New York Bureau of Municipal Research reports Rochester, New York, as being the most efficiently governed city of that state. In fact they assert that it is the most efficiently governed of all cities that came under their inspection. New York City, itself, is a shining light of efficiency since the election of Mr. John Purroy Mitchel as mayor. To show the applicability of the manager plan to such a metropolis is indeed a heavy burden which rests upon the affirmative. And yet under the old plan according to the mayor's report, the docks department

saved in 1914, \$312,000; Staten Island Ferry, which operated in 1912 at a deficit of \$189,000, showed a profit of \$15,000 in 1914. The budgets for the water works and the fire departments were greatly reduced, while the service and the lights were improved and extended. The health department, under Dr. Goldwater, demonstrated its superiority by giving New York City the lowest general death rate and the lowest infant mortality of any city in the United States, and this in great New York amid all its adverse conditions. Politics were practically eliminated from the administration, men being appointed simply because of some peculiar fitness for their position. The purchasing department cannot be overlooked. It saved to the city \$13,000 in one item of expenditure alone, the purchase of milk, and secured pasteurized instead of raw milk. As a result of such an administration New York City showed a saving in one year's administration of over two million dollars.

These citations afford evidence of the efficiency of the old forms of government. The results will correspond to any offered by the affirmative and are taken from all three classes of cities. They were secured by the same means employed under the manager plan. Therefore, we of the negative contend that a change in charter is not necessary.

The success of government at all times depends upon the intelligent participation of its citizens. We are willing to grant to the affirmative that there is an increased interest in the civic affairs incident to the adoption of their plan, but it devolves upon them to show that this

interest will be maintained when the change is forgotten. Good government is a matter of public interest, and public interest can be and is had under present forms. Bad government is a matter of indifference and corrupt human nature. Unless the affirmative can demonstrate that their plan will permanently remove these hindrances they cannot hope to establish their claim.

CITY MANAGER PLAN OF MUNICI-
PAL GOVERNMENT

II

CITY MANAGER PLAN OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

II

SOUTH DAKOTA WESLEYAN vs. ST. OLAF COLLEGE

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, C. D. JOHNSTON, SOUTH DAKOTA
WESLEYAN

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: Over fifty per cent. of the people in the United States live in cities, towns and villages and depend for their welfare upon the successful administration of municipal affairs. Moreover the municipality is the primary political unit and a movement to bring about good government in the city means good government for the state and the nation. Such a movement is embodied in the proposition for debate this evening: Resolved, That the City Manager Plan of government should be adopted by American municipalities.

The term municipalities means the cities, towns and villages incorporated under special charter or state regulation. The City Manager plan is not a specifically defined system of government but is any system evolved from the application of the manager principle to the

direction of municipal affairs. In the City Manager plan municipal government is vested in an elective, non-partisan, representative board or commission, which determines the policy of the city and then appoints an expert manager to be responsible for the execution of that policy. The manager is selected upon his expert qualifications for executive work and holds office just as long as he does that work efficiently. If he is inefficient he may be removed by the commission at any time. He is allowed to appoint his own subordinates and is then held responsible for the entire administration of the city's affairs. This brings these affairs under one directive head. The city's law, finance, public safety and health departments, parks and public works, and public utilities including streets, lights, sewers and water works are all co-ordinated under the general supervision of one responsible, expert administrator.

The manager principle is not a new principle. At the present time it is the back-bone of American business, the foundation of every business corporation. The stockholders select a board of men who represent their opinions and desires. This board of directors is legislative; it determines the policy of the corporation. But it selects an expert manager and makes him responsible for the execution of that policy and the administration of the corporation's affairs.

The same principle appears in our educational systems, in the school board and the superintendent. It is embodied in the direction of our colleges in the board of regents, or trustees, and the president. The board is

representative and determines the policy, the president executes it.

Nor is the principle new in its application to municipal corporations, for it was present in the germ in American colonial city government. But at that time the very little administrative work was done by special appointive committees. We may reasonably suppose that but for the advent of the federal constitution and its imitation by the cities, these appointive committees would have been concentrated, unified, and organized to meet the growing complexity of municipal problems, and the need for an expert would have developed into the appointive manager long ago. Thus by its long and successful use and practical application in American business and educational institutions, as well as through its potential presence in American colonial city government, the City Manager plan has proved itself more than a novelty.

It was introduced into the direction of our own municipal corporations in 1908 at Staunton, Va., but was not strongly agitated until its further adoption in 1912 by Sumter, S. C. Since that time five states have amended their constitutions to permit its adoption. To date it has been put into operation in over half a hundred cities in eighteen states, and no other cities in the United States have shown such a remarkable and rapid municipal progress and prosperity due to successful and efficient government.

We of the affirmative to-night advocate the further adoption of this plan by the whole normal class of American municipalities. We advocate it for three fun-

damental reasons: First, because the present forms are vitally defective and in need of reform; second, because the city manager plan actually corrects these defects by improving both the personnel and governmental organization of the present systems; and, third, because the city manager plan is to-day operating more successfully than any other form of municipal government. To show the need of the city manager plan I will prove to you that both the aldermanic and commission forms of municipal government are defective and do not give good government.

In the first place, the aldermanic form is defective for two reasons: First, because it is based upon the federal principle of separate and independent legislative and executive powers; and, second, because it permits its offices being filled through the domination of national political parties.

Speaking of the principle of the independent legislative and executive, H. G. James of the University of Texas says in his book, "Applied City Government," "It was the unjustifiable engrafting of a federal growth upon the municipal plant." In the national government where the principal function is legislative, where the personal rights and liberties of the people are involved, and where the ponderous machinery of a great state must of necessity move slowly, there the federal principle may be right, but in the municipality where the demand is for rapidity and efficiency of execution, the application of the federal check and balance becomes an illusion and a handicap.

The council is elected by the people; so is the mayor.

Both are equally independent and neither can look to a common authority. The government has two heads of equal power. Then the mayor is selected for his popularity and not for his executive ability. He is further disabled by having the council select his subordinates. On the other hand he can check any good legislation on the part of the council by his veto. The executive cannot execute, the legislative cannot legislate. It is a machine built for standing still. If good laws are not passed who is to blame, the council or the veto power of the mayor? If good laws are not executed who is to blame, the mayor or some subordinate appointed by the council? There is no one to be absolutely responsible for any one branch of the cities' affairs. They are checked and balanced to the point of organized inefficiency. The whole system forms a bulwark of complications for hidden graft and prevents the people from seeing the workings of their own government. Then the application of the federal principle to the administration of municipal affairs means a ruthless waste of time, energy and the people's money!

Second, with the adoption of the federal principle came the evil influence of national parties to dominate municipal politics. These parties know little about municipal issues and care less. They select the tickets and put in office not men who will serve the people and build a better city, but men who will serve the party and build a stronger ticket. This breeds corruption, harbors the spoils system, and propagates its rotten politics in our already defective municipal organization.

Its personnel selected on national issues, its policies determined by national parties, it cannot and does not interpret or respond to the popular will of the municipality. Its offices filled by the spoils system, its executive organization encumbered by cross responsibilities and innumerable complications, it cannot and does not efficiently carry out that will. Therefore, the aldermanic form is defective and does not meet the standard of good government.

In the second place, the commission form of government is defective, first, because it imposes both legislative and executive work upon one set of officers; and, second, because it divides the city's affairs under a five-headed executive.

Taking up the first point, the commission form is based upon an elective policy determining body which makes the laws of the municipality. The individual members of this board are then each given a department of the city's affairs to administrate. Administrators, to be efficient, must be chosen solely upon executive ability. This plan chooses men primarily as legislators and then assumes that they will have the technical knowledge, expert ability of efficient administrators. The assumption is plainly fallacious. It unduly restricts the field of representation, for no matter how truly representative a man is, he cannot serve the commission well unless he has executive ability. On the other hand, to become an executive he must serve on a representative board. It is evident that few men are both representative legislators and capable administrators. We are then between

the horns of a dilemma. If the people elect the commissioners upon their executive ability they will not form a truly representative policy determining body and, therefore, will not be responsive to the will of the people. If, on the other hand, the commissioners are elected upon their representative qualifications or positions, the government will be without efficient administrators and so cannot carry out the will of the people. Therefore, the commission principle of placing both legislative and executive work upon one set of officers is fallacious and detrimental to the cause of good government.

The commission form is defective in the second place because it divides the city's affairs under a five-headed executive. Each commissioner is interested in the one department in which he is supreme. There is no encouragement for co-operation for a failure in one department makes the returns from another department look greater in comparison. Responsibility is almost indeterminable for it may rest in any one of five individuals or in the commission as a whole. Such diffusion of executive responsibility makes a unified, systematized executive impossible. The commission form is the application of a divided organization to an undivided and undividable mass of public affairs. The result is wasteful overlapping, friction, and log-rolling. The sum total of this is inefficient administration. Therefore, the commission principle of a five-headed executive is also defective. Then, with its policy determining body acting as administrators, and its executive organization divided under five-headed supervision, the commission form is

fallacious and fails to meet the standard of good government.

I have now shown both the aldermanic and commission forms to be vitally defective and to fail to stand the test of good government. In proposing a remedy, the affirmative do not advocate a great overthrow of any existing institution, nor do we advocate the introduction of any radical and unknown system. I have shown the manager principle to be far from new and untried, to be at present embodied in the directive systems of many of our most common institutions, and to have worked there most successfully and efficiently. We of the affirmative simply advocate the further application of this same tried principle to the direction of municipal affairs. And we advocate its application through the forms of government already existing. We maintain that the application of this principle will so affect the forms of government that the plan evolved, the city manager plan, will afford a system which both interprets and efficiently executes the popular will.

Now I have shown both the aldermanic and commission forms of municipal government to be vitally defective and in need of correction. I have explained the medial plan which the affirmative propose. My colleagues will prove to you, first, that the application of the city manager plan as I have explained it improves the personnel and corrects the systematic defects in municipal government; and, second, that the result of the plan in operation is an unequaled advancement in ef-

iciency and economy as shown by the cities where it has been adopted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, DONALD E. HOFFMAN, SOUTH
DAKOTA WESLEYAN

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleague has presented the principle of the City Manager Plan and has shown that its application is needed to remedy the defects in our forms of city government. I will show that the application of the City Manager Plan provides: First, a better personnel of municipal government, and second, an organization which most readily lends itself to efficient action.

Under the City Manager Plan the governing personnel consists fundamentally of a small, policy-determining body—call it a board, a council, or a commission as you choose, together with a chief executive, called the City Manager. I will first show that the personnel of the board is improved.

The direct point of contact between the people and their government is found in the election of these board members. The number of offices to be filled is much smaller than under the mayor and council plan. This increases the weight of each vote cast. As Professor James of the University of Texas says, "It is a matter of common knowledge that the increase in the number of elective offices, which was thought to give more popular control, in reality diminishes the possibility of control." When but a few officers are chosen at one time the voter

weighs the candidates individually and does not limit his selection to mechanically marking the party column.

Further, under the City Manager Plan more highly efficient officers act as board members, for their work is tangible and productive of results. A practical and alert business or professional man will serve on a board when the marshalling of details, the execution of orders, and the minute executive oversight demanded on the part of efficient and economical city government is left to the manager. As Toulmin says in his book entitled, "The City Manager," "The City Manager Plan places the commissioner in a position which his previous experience has fitted him for, namely advice on business problems."

Furthermore, many men may be very competent to dictate or pass on matters of general policy when they would not make the best executives. In choosing these board members under the City Manager Plan the voter has but to satisfy himself in regard to the integrity and sound judgment of the men he selects—great executive ability is not essential.

Thus more able men are secured to serve the city on these boards: First, because they are more carefully chosen; second, because it allows obtaining the expert advice of men who cannot afford to sacrifice much valuable time from private affairs for city details; and third, because it makes eligible men who, while possibly lacking some executive ability, may be very valuable in an advisory or legislative capacity.

The governing personnel is improved in the second place because the manager is better fitted to perform his

duties than is the executive under any other system. It is in the matter of selecting the chief executive that the City Manager Plan differs from the commission form, and through this are the faults of the commission form remedied. The governing board, among its other duties, appoints the city manager. This is correct for his selection is properly a part of deliberative work. He is chosen strictly on a competitive basis and absolutely without regard to political affiliation. This selecting board can much more accurately gauge executive ability in an individual than can the electorate because the voter is not in a position to exercise his judgment to the best advantage when it comes to selecting for purely technical and administrative efficiency. The fact that the manager is chosen by a commission which has thoroughly and deliberately examined the qualifications of many applicants for the position speaks for his fitness.

Moreover, under the City Manager Plan the chief executive holds office as long as he gives satisfaction, while long tenures under elective selection are rare. The permanence thus made possible permits the city manager to educate himself seriously in municipal affairs, and makes it worth while for him to do so. He becomes an expert, a professional, in city problems, while to executives under other systems the position is an adventure into an unknown field. While our plan does not preclude getting a man from outside the city of his operations, it is not necessary to do so unless the selecting board feels positive that it is getting a better qualified man.

Thus the method of selection, the quality of permanence and expertness, and the broadening of the field from which selection is made, all tend toward an improvement in the qualifications of the chief executive. The type of men available for both the legislative or policy-determining offices and the administrative or policy-executing offices is greatly improved.

Not only does the City Manager Plan improve the personnel in these two respects but it does so without creating or permitting a spoils system. As Professor Charles A. Beard of Columbia University says in his "American City Government," "The first step in the direction of increased efficiency is the separation of politics from administration." This we propose to do by use of the City Manager Plan, under which the spoils system is eradicated for elections and appointments are made strictly non-political. This is done by use of the preferential, non-partisan ballot under which officers are chosen with absolutely no regard for state or national party lines. As H. M. Waite, City Manager of Dayton, says, "I cannot tell you the political faith of a single director, or employee. Wherever possible I secured men trained for the particular function which they perform. The men were secured as heads of their departments for their ability. There were no political debts to be paid." Thus the City Manager Plan makes city administration and not city politics an expert profession.

My second main contention is that the City Manager Plan provides an organization which most readily lends itself to efficient action. Such an organization must

embody three necessary characteristics. First, several minds for council and one for direct execution. Second, the absolute fixing of responsibility. Third, proper co-ordination and teamwork between departments. Now all of these are afforded by the City Manager Plan.

In the first place, our plan logically disposes of the old dispute between those who favor a single head in government affairs and the devotees of the group or council plan. Those who advocate a single head advance the argument that there is "nothing like a single head for efficiency," directness of execution and fixing of responsibility. Those who favor the group plan say that for determining policies "a commission is far better than a single individual" and that in many counsellors there is safety. They condemn one-man power.

The City Manager Plan incorporates the advantages of both views for it provides the wisdom and safety of several minds in the council or policy-determining body and at the same time has the directness in execution of a single individual. The board decides matters of general policy. The manager executes the policy and looks after the numberless details. The directors of any successful business corporation recognize the value of this principle as do also school boards. They know that for council many minds are best—for execution but a single head. In speaking of this chief executive in a city Professor James of the University of Texas says, "The chief administrative authority should, of course, be a single individual. No principle of administration, public or private, is more self-evident than that for effectiveness,

continuity, and rapidity of action, a single individual is best." Thus while the fusion of several minds is present when policies are determined under the City Manager Plan the execution of the findings of that body is very properly concentrated in one individual.

In the second place the City Manager Plan provides a better organization because the lines of responsibility are absolutely clear. There is no diffusion of responsibility among different committeemen, for the city manager is directly accountable for all executive duties. There are no committees. The manager knows he will be held to account if careless or slow and so acts with care and precision. People look to him in case a street is in bad shape, a sewer clogged, or supplies needed; and, knowing that he is accountable, he takes immediate and proper action. As Professor Beard of Columbia University says, "The multiple-headed department is now discredited because it has been discovered that when three are responsible, nobody is responsible. Hence cities are now moving rapidly in the direction of the single-headed administrative department in order to concentrate power and responsibility." Now under the City Manager Plan the non-responsive, sluggish, unsatisfactory committee system is done away with, together with its shifting of responsibility, and in its place stands a directness of execution and a quickness of response hitherto totally lacking in municipal affairs. Under our plan responsibility for all municipal action is easy to trace. The manager knows, in case he does not perform a duty himself, to which subordinate its execu-

tion was delegated. Accountability is no longer diffused among the mayor and groups of councilmen or between different commissioners and department heads as under other systems. In brief, individuals and not committees are responsible.

In the third place the City Manager Plan provides an organization which most readily lends itself to efficient action because unity and co-ordination of activities is assured. "The manager is accountable to the commission for the successful administration of the affairs of every department. One function cannot be sacrificed for another." The commissioners, being disinterested in so far as the individual departments are concerned, will, when determining policies or appropriating money, give each department such recognition as it deserves. Since all executive duties center in the manager the activities are harmonized. No longer is there a gap or overlapping in the fields covered by the different departments. The manager sees that they harmonize and work with, not against, each other. He is employed to see that the various activities work together like a well-regulated machine and being a professional, an expert, he can run that machine better than any number of amateurs. We see expertness applied at the head of administration and an executive in charge whose office acts as a clearing-house for all city affairs. Unity and co-ordination between departments prevail. Each activity is seen in its true perspective. In short, teamwork between departments, instead of being discounted, is encouraged.

Perhaps the washing of the streets of Dayton fits my

case. "For a long time it had been desired to flush the streets with water, but it required the co-operation of the fire department, the water-works department, and the public works department. Needless to say the streets were not washed." Upon the inauguration of the City Manager Plan the manager was able to set the thing going at once.

Thus we have: First, an organization which provides at the same time several minds for counsel and one for direct execution; second, an organization under which responsibility is absolutely fixed; and third, an organization through which the different departments and activities are co-ordinated and harmonized.

In summarizing, gentlemen, I have proved that the personnel of government is much improved, both in legislative and executive capacities. I have shown that this improvement takes place without creating or permitting a spoils system. I have also proved that an organization is provided which most readily lends itself to efficient action. The last speaker of the affirmative will prove: First, that the City Manager Plan is scientific and business-like in its methods, bringing economical results to our cities; and second, that the principles of the City Manager Plan are working successfully in actual practice.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, M. M. BRUMBAUGH, SOUTH DAKOTA
WESLEYAN

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: In concluding ~~the~~ direct argument for the affirmative, I shall show first,

that the methods of the City Manager Plan are scientific and business-like, and bring efficient and economical results to our cities. Second, that the City Manager Plan is in successful operation, and is resulting in greater saving and efficiency.

The management of any city is a business proposition, and differs in no respect from the management of a public service corporation. The primary purpose of each of these corporate bodies is efficiency, efficiency for results. Results in the one being gain as well as service, and in the other, the best possible city government at a reasonable cost. Our business concerns hire as manager, one who has managing ability, while we as municipal voters elect men to manage our city business largely through popularity, or because they have some particular pull and can deliver the votes, giving no heed as to their administrative or business ability. As a result of this haphazard management, our city money has been spent in an unbusiness-like manner, and our municipalities have accumulated debts, until in 1909 the per capita indebtedness for American cities amounted to \$60.69, \$65.85 in 1911, \$70.47 in 1912. A steady advance of about four dollars per year. What we clearly need is the application of business-like management to city business.

This applying of expert management to city business results in the first place, in increased efficiency. Under our present system of government, we have our alderman, councilmen, or commissioners trying to attend to their private business and at the same time serve the city

by administering the manifold details of government. Their interests are divided and their time limited.

Under the plan of the affirmative these officers merely sit as a legislative body, dictating the policy of the city government. The manager attends to all the details of the operation of the machinery of the city government, just as does the manager of a business corporation, subject to the direction of the board of directors in matters of broad policy. As the second speaker for the affirmative has shown, the tenure in office of the manager is not subject to that of the councilmen, or other elective officials. The manager being at the head of the municipal corporation keeps the affairs of the city running just as any business manager keeps the business of the corporation going even though changes are being made on the board of control. Thus, we derive the benefits of experienced management over a long period of time.

In the second place, the applying of expert management to city business brings economy, first, because the city manager becomes the purchasing manager for the city. Under the old systems the different departments of the city government are permitted to purchase their own supplies, and hence no attempt is made to save city money. But the city manager makes the purchasing of all supplies a business proposition and purchases for the city, just as a business manager purchases for his corporation. For example, in Dayton, requisitions for purchases are made out in duplicate, one going to the merchant as his order and the other is filed in the record of the General Manager's office. This assembling of all

buying under one head enables the city to profit by reductions made for quantity purchases, results obtained from sealed bidding, and businesslike buying. On page four of the First Annual Report of the City Commission for Dayton, we find this statement, "There has been effected a saving of \$33,000 this year over prices last year without sacrificing quality." In the report of the City Manager of St. Augustine, Florida, for Jan. 1, 1916, we find the statement "that a saving of from two per cent. to sixty per cent. has been made on the purchase of all commodities."

Economy results in the second place, because of the co-ordination between the departments. Under our plan the manager, not having any special sectional interests, gives equal interest to all departments and suggests to the legislative body the appropriations which give the greatest benefit to the greatest number. Much money is saved by this co-ordination. In Staunton, Virginia, prior to the adoption of the City Manager Plan, the waterworks department hired teams to haul pipes from the cars to the place of usage, while teams and wagons belonging to the street department were standing idle. With the coming of the manager this was changed and, one set of teams did the work for both departments.

Economy results, in the third place, because the expert, giving all his time to the city, saves large amounts of money by investigating all projects and determining the real need. At Manistee, Michigan, the sewer system was not giving good service under the old system and all preparation had been made to bond the city to the

extent of \$80,000 for the purpose of constructing a new system. In the meantime the people of that city adopted the City Manager Plan of government. By investigation the manager found that the old sewer merely needed cleaning, in as much as it had not received such attention in the twenty-nine years of operation under the old system. He cleaned this sewer at a total cost of \$1200, thereby saving the city on his first piece of work, the amount of \$78,800. When Mr. Ashburner was elected as City Manager of the city of Staunton, Virginia, cement sidewalk work was being done at a cost of \$2.25 per square yard; the manager immediately took over this work and did it as a city proposition at a total cost of 96¢ per square yard,—less than half the cost under the mayor and council system. We do not imply that cheap government is necessarily good government, but we do maintain that better government at the same cost or the same government at a smaller expenditure is much to be desired.

My second contention is that, the City Manager Plan is in successful operation, and has resulted in greater saving and efficiency in the cities where it has been adopted.

Despite the fact that this is a new venture in city government, the movement has spread very rapidly until now it has been adopted by at least sixty-eight cities. Now an important point is this, that these cities are not limited to any particular class or locality, but include both large and small cities situated in different parts of our country, La Grand, Oregon, with a population of

4843; Dayton, Ohio, population 123,800; Clark, South Dakota, population 1200; and Lardo, Florida, population 291. The fact that the plan is working in these cities of diverse circumstances proves that it is applicable to the various types of cities in this country.

During the past two weeks, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have secured letters from leading men in the various cities where the plan is in operation; time will not permit me to quote from all of them. Here is a communication from Lewis C. Spooner, member of the Minnesota State Legislature, in which he says, "The city of Morris, Minnesota, is operating under the City Manager Plan. I am the largest taxpayer in the city. I like the management of our city affairs because it is more efficient, more economical, and in every way more satisfactory."

Here is a statement from J. H. Devenney, President of the Morris, Minnesota, National Bank, in which he says, "This form of government has worked out fine. A general improvement is noticeable. Ninety per cent. of the people are satisfied and nothing would induce us to return to the old system. The city is managed by a systematic organization and co-ordination of the various departments which tends for economy on the one side and efficiency on the other."

Again, a night letter by George O. Gilbert, Cashier of the Montrose National Bank, of Montrose, Colorado, states, "Manager form in Montrose has within ten months resulted in the largest bank balance in the history of the city. Large reduction in taxes for next year. At the same time the city's activities are being extended

rather than being reduced. Modern system of book-keeping is bringing in all monies due the city. While I did not vote for this form of government, yet I am well pleased with its results."

Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have recently written a number of letters, not to the city managers, for they might be prejudiced in favor of our plan, but to the mayors and council presidents of the cities in which the plan is in operation. In these letters we asked five questions. We received replies from twenty-four of these letters.

The first question asked was this:—Has there been any opposition to the plan and if so by whom? From the twenty-four replies received, ten answered "no"; fourteen answered, "yes," by the politicians and those who wished to exploit the city.

Second question:—Has the City Manager Plan held popular interest? Three replied "no" and twenty-one answered "yes."

Third question:—Has the efficiency of the various departments been maintained under the city manager? The reply was unanimously "yes."

Fourth question:—Has the city manager proved more economical? One said there was no change, one answered "no," and twenty-two answered "yes."

Fifth question:—Has the indebtedness of your city been reduced? Three said there had been no change in the indebtedness of their city, while twenty-one said that the indebtedness of their city had been reduced under the City Manager Plan.

These cities also report great saving without increasing the taxation, for example, during the six years previous to the adoption of the City Manager Plan, the city of Dayton, Ohio, operated with an annual deficit of \$60,000, while during the first eighteen months of operation under the new system she reduced her debts \$71,045 and increased her assets \$407,324 without increasing her taxation, and during the first year gave \$140,000 worth of new service, without taking into consideration that the old government had used \$800,000 of a flood prevention bond issue for ordinary operating expenses and therefore made an unusual showing. During the first year of operation under this system Big Rapids, Michigan, reduced her debts \$52,000; Springfield, Ohio, paid a floating debt of \$100,000, enlarged its street cleaning department twenty-five per cent., extended a garbage collection system to all houses, and saved \$50,000 over the operating expenses of the year before. At Le Grand, Oregon, the city manager found the city bankrupt and its town warrants depreciated to such an extent that the banks would not take them at any price. During the first sixteen months' operation under the new plan, the city paid off \$70,000 of these warrants. In Manistee, Michigan, the new government saved twenty per cent. on a budget of \$104,000; Taylor, Texas, during the first year made a fifteen per cent. better showing; Cadillac, Michigan, saved thirteen per cent.; Hickory, North Carolina, fourteen per cent.; Morris, Minnesota, fifteen per cent.; and St. Augustine, Florida, during the first five months operation under this

system, made a better showing of fifteen per cent. This financial saving has not been due to the raising of the tax rates, but to a systematizing of the city's business.

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is first hand evidence, I submit it as proof that the City Manager Plan is proving practicable and efficient in actual operation. My opponents cannot answer this argument. They may quote to you from politicians and disgruntled office seekers, but they dare not go to the masses of the people where this system is in actual operation and procure an answer to our argument.

*MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE vs. SOUTH
DAKOTA WESLEYAN*

FIRST NEGATIVE, ERNEST G. SMITH, SOUTH DAKOTA
WESLEYAN, '16

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The affirmative, to establish their case to-night, must prove three assertions: first, that the present forms of city government are inherently wrong and a new form is necessary; second, that the City Manager Plan will work better and will not be productive of greater evils; third, that the City Manager Plan is applicable to all American Municipalities.

The negative will establish; first, that the City Manager Plan is wrong in principle; second, that it is impracticable in operation; third, that it is not necessary.

I shall show that the City Manager Plan is wrong in principle, first because it is based upon a distrust of

citizenship. This distrust of citizenship is in direct contradiction to the fundamentals of the American Political System—a system that declares unreservedly in the right and ability of the people to choose those who shall conduct the government. We have in this country a republican form of government, in which the people demand the right to elect at least those officials in whose hands is placed the greatest power. In every department of government—city, state, or national—the chief executive is elected directly by the people. The success of government in this country is ample proof of the ability of the people to judge executive qualifications. The Plan advocated by the affirmative, however, disregards this fundamental right of the American people. It is based upon the proposition that the people are unable to judge executive qualities in candidates. Under the manager system of government, the selection of the manager, the most important single official in the entire city, is taken from the people and placed in the hands of the commission, to whom alone he is responsible. The people have no voice whatever in his selection. Therefore, Gentlemen, we must condemn the principle of the City Manager Plan, based, as it is, on distrust of citizenship and lack of faith in the people to discriminate in the selection of their chief executive.

The City Manager Plan is wrong in principle in the second place, because the government is too far removed from the people. The manager, the head of the administrative force of the city, and the entire executive department are removed from both popular election and

direct popular control. The only means of control which the people have over the entire administrative department is indirectly through the commission. Suppose the people desire the removal of some administrative official, such as the Superintendent of Public Safety. They would first be required to recall the commission and elect a new set of commissioners that would discharge the manager if he still refused to dismiss the undesirable official. Hence, to remove this one official, a subordinate in the executive department, the commission must be recalled and the manager discharged.

This means of controlling administrative officials is too indirect and unwieldy to work successfully. The people are always reluctant to hold one official responsible for the acts of another. If the commissioners were performing their legislative duties satisfactorily, the electorate would hesitate to recall them on account of the manager. This defect is one that cannot be remedied, for it is inherent in any manager system of government. One of the fundamentals of the manager principle is that one man shall have control of the entire administrative department, that all the inferior administrative officials shall be appointed and removed by the manager. Every step inserted between the people and the ultimate administrator reduces popular interest to just that extent. Just the extent to which popular interest is reduced, so is the effectiveness of government decreased. Mr. Oswald Ryan, in his book, "Municipal Freedom," declares, "Government by experts alone is undesirable and out of harmony with American political

ideals. A staff of permanent officials out of touch with the electorate, tends to develop into a professional bureaucracy, tied up with red tape and unresponsive to popular will and needs." Therefore, the City Manager Plan, by removing the entire executive department from the direct jurisdiction of the electorate, violates that fundamental requirement of a republican form of government—popular control of important officials—and is again demonstrated as being unsound.

The manager plan is wrong in principle in the third place, because it places men in control of the city's government who have no personal interest in the city's affairs. One of the fundamental requirements of a good government is that those who exercise the powers of government should have a natural interest in the affairs of those governed. The City Manager Plan, however, overlooks this important fact. It allows the commission to go to any part of the country to secure their manager. Hence, this most important position is occupied by a man who has no personal interest in the city except his salary. And not only may the Manager be secured from any place, but he is given the power of securing his subordinates wherever they may be found. Therefore, the City Manager Plan, by placing men in control of the government whose interest in the city's affairs is merely hired and temporary, violates that important requirement of an efficient government.

The City Manager Plan is wrong in principle in the third place, because it is essentially a "one man" government. The affirmative, by the analogy which they

have drawn between the proposed plan and the method of controlling a corporation have practically admitted that the plan would result in "one man" government. For we can readily see the policy-determining power of the manager of a business concern. Any new line of development, the installation of different equipment, or a change in the general policy of the corporation are made upon the suggestion of the manager. The board of directors appreciate that to attempt to legislate would create friction with the manager. If they do not approve the acts of the manager, their only recourse is to discharge him, not to attempt to dictate the policy of the corporation.

Note how this will hold true in the City Manager Plan of government. The affirmative assume that the manager will be purely an executive. There may be a few cases in which the manager will be willing to submit to the dominance of the commission. But in such cases they will cater to the devices and interests of the commission, thereby creating opportunities for graft and making the operation of the spoils system both possible and probable.

But as a matter of fact, the manager will exercise great legislative power. Consider his action in the development of a city park system. He will outline his plan, stipulating the number of parks, their location, the methods of laying out and developing, and the amount of money to be expended—matters purely legislative. Observe his method of caring for the finances of the city. The manager will stipulate the amount of money

to be raised, the methods to be used in raising these funds, and how they are to be expended. Note his plan of handling the public safety. He could hold that certain methods were or were not necessary or that certain laws should or should not be enacted for the suppression of vice and the care of the public welfare.

The affirmative will doubtless admit that this will be the natural course of procedure, but will insist that the manager is not a legislator because he does not have final voice in legislative matters. But what really happens is this. The commission will act as the board of directors of a corporation does—give the manager a free hand and allow him to legislate. The commission must do this for two reasons. First, to allow the manager to prove his worth. He will succeed or fail by his own measures. Second, the failure to adopt his ideas of legislation will create friction between the commission and the manager. And, as my colleague will show, this has actually happened in some cities. The manager can then attribute the failure of any of his projects to the fact that the commission has not adopted his ideas of legislation. Thus the adoption of the manager plan means the establishment of a “one man” government. The manager will practically have control of both departments. Honorable William D. Foulke, ex-president of the National Municipal League, says, “Suppose that instead of calling him the city manager you call him the city boss.” The commission is forced to give in to the manager and allow him to legislate. If they do not approve the acts of the manager, their only practical

recourse is to discharge him. The same process will be repeated. "One man" government will continue.

History has shown the failure of such a highly concentrated governmental authority. The present American Political Institutions were established for the one purpose of doing away with "one man" government. Political revolutions in every nation have had as one of their prime objects to free the people from "one man" power. To enjoy equal rights, the people must have adequate safe-guards. There must be some system whereby the people will have an adequate check upon the officials. Power must be distributed. By concentrating the governmental authority in the hands of a single individual, and he removed from both popular election and direct popular control, the opportunities for mismanagement are abundant. Consequently, no individual should be entrusted, for however short a time, with management of the affairs of the people of any city. Gentlemen, consider what this "one man" power would mean in the city of New York, with her 5,500,000 people, with her annual budget four times the combined expenditures of the states of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, and Illinois, and with problems far more intricate than those confronting the officials of practically any state in the Nation. Yet the affirmative must advocate this plan for such cities as New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, and San Francisco with their millions of people, as well as for Gayville, Lincoln, and Jefferson with their few hundred.

Gentlemen, I have submitted the City Manager Plan to four universally recognized tests of good government. Its failure to measure up to these tests has demonstrated the unsoundness of the principle of the proposal. In its denial of the ability of the people to choose their chief executive, it repudiated the basic doctrine of a republican form of government—faith and belief in the electors to discriminate in the selection of their chief officials—and substitutes, therefore, a distrust of citizenship. In its removal of the executive department from both popular election and direct popular control it demands that direct government be replaced by indirect government. In its dependence upon hired interests, it destroys one of the fundamentals of an efficient government—that of natural interest. In its corporation scheme of city government, in which one man, the manager, is in position not only to administer but also to dictate legislation, it destroys with one sweeping blow the system of checks and balances so characteristic of our American government to prevent “one man” power.

Gentlemen, we ask for the rejection of a plan so unsound in principle as to direct its attack against the ability of the people of American cities to select their chief officials, against the doctrine of direct government, against the principle of natural interest, and against the system of checks and balances to prevent “one man” power.

SECOND NEGATIVE, BERNIE BRERETON, SOUTH DAKOTA
WESLEYAN

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The City Manager Plan has been in practice only four years. We maintain that a period of four years is too short a time to try out any form of government and prove it effectual for universal adoption. Think what it would mean to take over fifty millions of people from under the present forms of city government and establish over them a plan which has not had time to prove itself preferable. This is exactly what the affirmative must propose in order to establish their case.

For instance Commission government has been meeting with success for more than fifty years. During this time it has been applied in nearly four hundred cities, bringing about economic and social reforms. Would you bar this already successful form of administration from practice and put in its place a plan which has not proved itself superior? A manufacturer would not overhaul his plant; throw out equipment that had been doing his work efficiently, or an appliance which had proved successful, and institute in its place equipment or machinery that had not been shown to be dependable. This is what the affirmative propose to do with our city governments.

According to the last report of the National Short Ballot Association the City Manager principle has been applied in but fifty-six cities; it is in practice in only forty-eight, and in at least one-sixth of these it has been

in operation but three months. Its largest city of operation is of 116,000 population, and it has been applied in but seven cities of more than 25,000 inhabitants. Yet the affirmative advocate establishing this City Manager Plan in our 14,186 municipalities, ranging in size from six million to two hundred inhabitants, on the inadequate and questionable trial of forty-eight cities.

My colleague has shown that the City Manager Plan is wrong in theory (1) Because it is based on distrust of citizenship. (2) Because it is too far removed from the people. (3) Because it is based on hired interest. (4) Because it results in "one man" government.

In continuing the argument for the negative I will show that the City Manager Plan is not practicable for three reasons. (1) Because it is not applicable to all municipalities; (2) Because in cities where it appears to be the most successful it has not proved more effective than other forms of city government; (3) Because it has failed in places where tried.

The City Manager Plan is impracticable in the first place because it is not applicable to all municipalities. New York City with its population consisting of more Germans of German descent than of native, more Jews than in Warsaw, and more Italians than in Naples or Venice, requires different government than that of the City of Burbank. Different conditions and evils arise in the various cities and must be met by various methods and plans. Pittsburgh has practically no middle class but abounds in the extremes of capital and labor; Newport is a city of millionaires; the population of Houston,

Texas, is one-half negro. Some cities are poor, some wealthy. There are cities of knowledge and cities of ignorance; cities of refinement, cities of illiteracy. They differ, require different treatment, different government. Oswald Ryan, in his book, "Municipal Freedom," says, "Frequently cities are saddled with administrative machinery ill-adapted to their local conditions, or administrative methods ill-fitted to their local needs. Cities often reveal the greatest diversity of conditions, and what is good for one may be bad for another." In consideration of such facts it is irrational to advocate one form of government for all our municipalities.

Cities also differ in size as well as in composition. Take first, New York, the largest city in the world. It will be enough to picture the task that would confront the City Manager. A city of six million inhabitants would await his administration. He would have charge of twenty-nine departments, over 80,000 employees, and an annual expenditure of two hundred million dollars. Due to such complexity of government and multiplicity of duties no Manager would be capable of efficient administration.

On the other hand Managers would and do prove too expensive for small cities. Think what a burden would be imposed on the tax-payer of a small village in order to hire an efficient manager, when his average salary is \$3000 a year. The City Clerk of Lakeland, Florida, states, "We have tried the City Manager Plan out and have been forced to give it up as the Manager's ex-

penses were too great for a city of 7500 people." The President of the Council of Phoenix, Arizona, reports the same trouble and says, "The Manager is a luxury." Thus as the City Manager Plan would prove deficient in large cities due to complexity of government and multiplicity of duties, he would also prove too expensive for small municipalities.

The universal adoption of the City Manager Plan is impracticable in the second place because it has not proved more effective than other forms of city government. James Middleton on pages 538 to 542 of the *World's Work* for this month, states that New York City daily is saving thousands of dollars through its buying commission. That in fourteen years through good government and supervision of living conditions the death rate has been lowered from nineteen to thirteen per cent. The February *Review of Reviews* for 1914 states on pages 171 to 178, that in New York City expertness is being applied under the Mayor and Council, saving that city millions of dollars a year. That they have no spoils system but all their positions are protected by civil service requirements. That their non-partisan and expert form has proved efficient and has given the people what they desire, good government. St. Albans, Vermont, a progressive city of 6500 people, is governed by a mayor and six aldermen. Its tax rate is limited to two per cent. of its assessed valuation. It spends fifty-five per cent. of its taxes on its school system and with the remaining forty-five per cent. it carries on the city. The people are entirely satisfied.

Commission government at the present time is governing over one-fifth of our population successfully. Houston, Texas, a city of 80,000, in three years retired a floating debt of \$400,000 without a bond issue; \$40,000 was received in interest on city deposits when formerly there had been no interest paid. The same form in 1912 threw out of Salt Lake City a powerful political machine, and saved that city in its first six months of operation \$18,000 in the buying of supplies alone. In Pontiac, Michigan, it retired in fifteen months a debt of \$94,000. It reduced the tax rate from eleven to eight dollars per thousand, and at the same time made improvements amounting to \$67,000. These facts show that reforms and savings, better than any the affirmative can show under City Manager Plan, can be inaugurated under the present forms. Our present plans of government may have their slight defects, but to give the administrative and policy making powers of all our municipalities into the control of this City Manager Plan, when, this plan has proved no better than other forms, would be radically unwise.

In the third place the City Manager Plan is impracticable for universal adoption because it has failed in places where tried. This deficiency has been due, first, to the lack of permanence of policy. The city is at the mercy of the manager's whims, failings, prejudices. He begins his term with a number of pet projects oblivious to the incompleted projects of his predecessor. He inaugurates financial reforms and when his work is well started his administration closes and his successor to

whom finance may be Greek, begins talking about an elaborate park system. Under such oscillating direction constructive civic effort is constantly checked. No sooner is one executive educated than he is displaced or resigns and the process of enlightenment recommences. Such executives are both unstable and expensive. In actual practice managers are proving to be amateur and transient. Hickory, North Carolina, has had four managers in two and one-half years, and on February 1, 1916, the fourth resigned. Big Rapids, Michigan, two in nine months. Beaufort, South Carolina, two in ten months. Carr, in Cadillac but a year, now in Niagara Falls, left Cadillac without a Manager. This is certainly not permanence of policy.

It has failed in places where tried, second, because of friction between the commission and the manager and the manager and the people. In Sumter, South Carolina, the interference of one of the commissioners seriously hampered the manager's work, and was one of the causes for abandoning the plan in that city. The Council President of Sandusky, Ohio, states, "We have had friction between both the manager and the commission and the manager and the people." In Phoenix, Arizona, the plan has proved a failure on account of friction. The President of the Council of that city states, "Here the City Manager Plan has neither removed the spoils system or party politics. It is satisfactory in only a few minor ways. It has neither held popular interest nor proved economical." City Manager Otis of Beaufort, South Carolina, reports, "The first manager of this City

attempted to govern in both legislative and executive departments, over the heads and contrary to the wishes of the commission. There was constant factional fights resulting in his dismissal and a subsequent recall of the commissioners for having dismissed him." In Grove City, Pennsylvania, the City Manager Plan has failed in every respect. According to a record of the council proceedings, which I hold here in my hand, there has been friction in every department; and on February 4, 1916, the council repealed the ordinance creating the office of City Manager at the first reading.

In Ohio where the manager plan has been tried for four years and where one city furnishes its strongest proof, more cities have voted the plan down than have adopted it. These cities have been viewing the best proof the manager plan has to offer for four years, and yet they reject it. In the remodeling of their charters they never consider it. Such instances of friction and weakness show that the plan has its share of infirmities. That it is subject to the same ills as other forms. They show that at least in some cities it is no better and not as good as the old form. The affirmative will agree that it would be unfair to force a form of government on a city against its will when it would not work in that city on account of expense, friction, or graft. Then, Gentlemen, how can the affirmative advocate the universal adoption of such a plan which we have shown the question to imply?

Ladies and gentlemen, my colleague has already shown that the City Manager Plan is wrong in theory. I have

shown that it is impracticable for universal adoption (1) Because it is not applicable to all municipalities; (2) Because in cities where it appears to be the most successful it has not proved more effective than other forms of city government; (3) Because it has failed where tried. The next speaker of the negative will uphold the contention that the City Manager is unnecessary.

In closing I would ask the next speaker of the affirmative this important question: What action will you take concerning the cities which are being governed efficiently and economically under other forms of city government? Also what action will you take concerning the cities which have either voted the Manager plan out after having given it a fair trial or have voted it down because they have preferred their present form?

THIRD NEGATIVE, L. G. DRUSCHEL, SOUTH DAKOTA
WESLEYAN

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Thus far in the debate we of the negative have shown the city manager plan of government to be wrong in principle and impracticable as a measure for universal adoption. In concluding the argument it shall be my purpose to show that this form of government is unnecessary.

In the first place it is not desired by all American municipalities. The affirmative have made much of the fact that some seventy-five cities have within the last three years adopted this form of government. But in reality it was adopted in over twenty of them without

the people being given the opportunity to vote upon it since the council adopted it by city ordinance. Moreover thirty-seven cities after considering the plan refused to accept it. The city council of Benton Harbor, Michigan, forced a city manager upon the people after they had twice voted down the city commissioner-manager plan. Mt. Vernon, New York, a year ago rejected the plan by one hundred and fifty votes and on the 11th of last January voted it down by nine hundred and fifty-seven votes. The city of Lockport, New York, in which this plan originated refused to accept it. If the number of cities which accept a reform be any criterion as to the desirability of the reform, then likewise the number of cities which refuse to accept it is a criterion as to its undesirability. The affirmative are advocating a form of government which forty-five per cent. of those cities voting upon it have refused to accept, which many cities in changing their form of government have not deemed worthy of consideration, and which has proved a failure in several of the cities which have accepted it.

Our present forms of government are operating satisfactorily in many places. Nearly four hundred cities ranging in population from 1000 to 400,000 are being governed under the commission form. In many others the mayor and council form prevails. My second colleague has given you examples showing the successful operation of both these forms of government. Other cities are operating satisfactorily under the town meeting system. Brookline, Massachusetts, recently voted to retain its town meeting system in spite of a great in-

crease in population. The majority of our cities are satisfied with their present forms of administration. They would raise serious objections to the change to the city manager plan. If present forms of government are giving satisfaction no change is needed. Therefore, since many cities have already voted down the city manager form and since many more would not desire to change their form, the city manager plan is both unnecessary and undesirable.

The manager plan is unnecessary in the second place because all defects found in our present city governments may be removed without a change of form. Frank G. Bates, Professor of Political Science at the University of Indiana, in analyzing our municipal problems finds the most serious to be:—

1. Waste of city resources.
2. Interjection of partisan politics.
3. State interference in purely local affairs.

The waste of city resources has been indeed a shortcoming in city government. This has been largely due to lack of control over public funds. These wastes may be eliminated by the adoption of the scientific budget, modern accounting methods, scientific purchasing of city supplies, time sheets and cost accounting. These measures present an annual financial program for the city and through publicity every voter may know what is being done with his money. These measures are not inherent in city manager cities alone but are possible under any form of city government.

Many cities without a manager have profited by their

adoption. For instance, Pontiac, Michigan, under a commission form of government by means of its accounting system reduced taxes \$2.96 in fifteen months time. In Cleveland a purchasing agent saved the city \$100,000 in one year's time. New York City by means of its budget and accounting methods saved \$1,000,000 in the street lighting department in the past two years and reduced the appropriations for another department from four million to one and one-half million dollars with an increase in the efficiency of both departments. In fact, Arch M. Mandel of the Dayton Bureau of Research writing in the *Annals* for November, 1915, says, "For 1916 it will be recommended that the budget of Dayton be elaborated in accordance with the procedure prepared for New York City by the New York Bureau of Municipal Research." This same budget is in operation in Springfield, Massachusetts. Evidently city manager cities can profit by the experience of other cities so that no change of government is needed.

The second fault found with municipal administration is the injection of partisan politics. To prevent this certain features such as the non-partisan nomination and ballot, the initiative, referendum, and recall, the civil service, the preferential ballot, and proportional representation have been introduced by some cities. These measures are applicable to all cities.

The nomination by petition and without party designation or endorsement will remove the evils of partisan politics from the city election. The civil service, the initiative, referendum, and recall work equally well in

all cities. Likewise the preferential ballot, and proportional representation. Any one of these devices may be and all except the last one have been combined with each form of government. Consequently the advocates of no one plan can put forward an exclusive claim to them. They will work as successfully under existing forms as under a city manager and no new evils will be introduced.

The third fault found with municipal administration is the interference by the state in purely local affairs. The people of a community know best the needs of that community and the administrative agencies adapted to those needs. They should have the right to determine the scope of local government within the necessary limitations of the state constitution. Not only do state legislatures interfere with the fundamental rights of cities but their consent is required to the most insignificant undertakings on the part of municipal government. Members of the state legislatures can not be expected to understand the perplexing problems of municipal affairs. Yet some idea of the legislative interference may be gained from the fact that out of 1200 bills introduced into the New York Legislature in 1914, 525 related to local communities, and 217 affected New York City alone.

The best way to insure good government in our cities is to make the people responsible for their own government. Oswald Ryan, author of "Municipal Freedom," says, "The principle of municipal home rule may be regarded as the first step in the direction of a responsive and efficient city government." New York City's recent improvement is the result of the obtaining of municipal

home rule. Efficient government follows because then the people really govern their own city and they become interested in it. Thus the principal defects found in our city governments may be eliminated through the adoption of the scientific budget, and modern accounting methods, by the use of the social reforms suggested, and by the furthering of municipal home rule. These reforms may be brought about without a change in the form of present city government. Therefore there is no necessity for the adoption of the city manager plan with the new problems which it will introduce.

Not only is the city manager form of government unnecessary but it tends to alienate public interest in city affairs. Good government depends not on form but rather on public interest. No device or institution however perfect can take the place of an intelligent and alert citizenship. As City Manager Waite of Dayton says, "No matter what form of government a city may have if the people themselves are not interested in it, that government will never be a success."

The city manager plan is but a new mechanism of government. It tends to destroy public interest rather than create it. The enthusiasm aroused by the campaign for a change of government will soon wear off. As my first colleague has shown the city manager is twice removed from the people, they have no control over him, consequently the electorate will lose interest in the affairs of government. City Manager Waite was asked if the plan would endure, "That all depends on whether we can keep the people interested," he replied. Herman

G. James of the University of Texas and an advocate of the plan says, "If indifference takes hold of the electorate and an unworthy commission be permitted to exercise the powers of government then the city manager plan will be no better than any other." J. W. Clinton, a wealthy property owner of Dayton, is quoted in the *Sioux City Tribune* for December 2, 1915, as saying that the newness of the plan had worn off and that already the people were losing interest. Other cities report practically the same. In fact as we have already shown several have abandoned it.

The existing forms tend to hold interest because they are closer to the people. The participation in the annual or biennial election keeps the voter interested in the work accomplished by the official elected. With the adoption of the reforms we have suggested, interest will be still more sustained. Add to these if necessary, a live commercial club, and a city planning commission. Provide that all bonds issued shall be sold to the citizens themselves. Thus the success of our present forms will be guaranteed without the unnecessary introduction of a new plan bringing in new problems.

In this debate to-night we have advanced fundamental objections to the city manager plan of government. We have shown that the very principle is wrong in that it is based upon a distrust of citizenship, it is too far removed from the people, it is government by hired interests in that it results in one man government. We have shown not only the principle to be wrong but that it is impracticable as a measure for universal adoption,

because it is not applicable to all American municipalities, because where it has had its greatest success it has not proved more effective than present forms of government, because it has actually failed in places where it has been tried.

We have further shown that it is undesirable because many cities have refused to accept it, and others would not wish to change their form of government; that it is unnecessary since the defects found in our present system may be removed by the adoption of the scientific budget and accounting systems, by the elimination of partisan politics, and by the obtaining of municipal home rule; and not only is it unnecessary but it would be detrimental because it destroys public interest, the first essential of good government.

MORNINGSIDE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE CITY MANAGER PLAN

- Business Managing a City*—I. F. Marcossou; *Collier's*, 52:5-6, Jan. 3, '14.
- City Manager Plan; the application of business methods to municipal gov't*, H. M. Waite—*American City*, 11:11, July, '14.
- Commission Form vs. Manager Plan*, Bradford & Gilbertson—*American City*, 10:37-40, Jan., '14.
- Democracy Chooses an Autocrat*, W. W. Renwick—*Tech. World*, 21:13-9, Mar., '14.
- Driving Politics out of Dayton*—*Lit. Digest*, 48:147-8, Jan. 24, '13.
- How Dayton's City Manager Plan is Working*, L. D. Upson—*R. of R.*, 49:1714-7, June, '14.
- Progress of the City Manager Plan*—*R. of R.*, 49:144-5, Feb., '14.
- Town Manager a City Engineer*—K. Riddle—*American City*, 9:523, Dec., '13.

City Manager Plan—Outlook, 104:887-9, Aug. 23, '13.

Dayton's Step Forward in City Gov't—World's Work, 26:614, Oct., '13.

How a Little City is Progressing Under a City Commission (Fredericksburg, Va.), A. T. Embrey—*American City*, 9:25-7, July, '13.

Practical Short Ballot in Sumter—Outlook, 104:50-51, May 10, '13.

Progress of Simpler Municipal Gov't—World's Work, 26:236, June, '13.

City Manager and the Next Step—American City, 12:1-2, Jan., '15.

City Manager's Troubles—Lit. Digest, 50:1078, May 8, '15.

City Managing, A New Profession—Independent, 80:433, Dec. 21, '14.

City Managing, The Newest Profession—Survey, 33:309, Dec. 19, '14.

Engineer as City Manager—H. M. Waite, Engineering Magazine, 48:894, Mar., '15.

How the City Manager Plan is working in a small California Municipality—P. E. Kressly, American City, 12:102, Feb., '15.

Town Manager under a Town Meeting Charter—G. Farrell, American City, 6-7, Jan., '15.

City Manager Plan in Forty-five Cities—American City, 12:499-507, June, '15.

How the City Manager Plan was Handicapped at Sumter, S. C.—American City, 12:511-14, June, '15.

Reports from Other Cities regarding the City Manager Plan—American City, 12:507, June, '16.

What the City Managers Are Supposed to Do—American City, 12:508-9, June, '15.

The City Manager a New Profession—Harry A. Toulmin, Appleton & Co., 633 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill.

•

OPEN DOOR POLICY IN CHINA

•

OPEN DOOR POLICY IN CHINA

KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE vs KANSAS STATE NORMAL

In dual debate on the evening of January 28th, 1916, the Kansas State Agricultural College met the Kansas State Normal in a discussion of the policy of the United States toward the Orient. This debate was the second of three annual dual debates to be held between these two institutions. In this year's debate one judge rendered the decision. The Kansas State Agricultural College affirmative lost to the Kansas State Normal negative at Manhattan, and the Kansas State Agricultural negative defeated the Kansas State Normal affirmative at Emporia.

The question was stated as follows: Resolved, that the United States should insist that the Open Door Policy, as laid down by John Hay, be strictly respected by all nations. (Agreed that "insist" may mean insistence to the point of arms.)

The speeches of the Kansas State Agricultural College were contributed by Dr. J. G. Emerson, Professor of Public Speaking, and by Dr. John R. Macarthur, Professor of English, both of the Kansas State Agricultural College.

OPEN DOOR POLICY IN CHINA¹

KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE vs. KANSAS STATE NORMAL

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, F. H. DILLENBACK, KANSAS STATE
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '14

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: The question under discussion is, "Resolved, that the United States should insist that the Open Door Policy, as laid down by John Hay, be strictly respected by all nations." The Open Door Policy in China is by no means a dead issue. The world war in Europe, its far reaching effects in Asia, the great political and economic changes that are now taking place in China, the completion of the Panama canal, the ready access which it gives the United States to the Pacific ocean, all these make it imperative that the Open Door Policy be studied and understood, and that some decision be reached regarding its continuance as a policy.

The Open Door Policy was first definitely stated by John Hay in 1899 at the close of the Boxer rebellion. At this time the United States, not wishing to see China partitioned among the several powers and her trade monopolized by them, submitted to each of the powers the agreement now known as the Open Door Policy.

Although no nation actually signed it, they all officially approved it, thus giving the Open Door Policy a much higher status internationally and in the councils of our own country than is accorded to even so well an established policy as our own Monroe Doctrine. The Open Door Policy as then formulated and since interpreted by all the great nations provides that all nations shall enjoy equal privileges of trade in China.

Before entering upon a discussion of this kind, it is necessary to understand clearly the provisions of this policy. This agreement provides: First, that the agreement itself will in no way interfere with any treaty port or vested interest within any so called "sphere of interest" or leased territory it may have in China. Second, that the Chinese tariff shall remain in force and continue to be collected by the Chinese government. Third, that no higher harbor duties or freight rates shall be charged citizens of another nationality than are charged its own citizens under similar circumstances.

Honorable judge, this policy was recognized at the time of its conception to have a meaning and mission other than the one just stated, and this mission has since been interpreted by our own statesmen as well as by those of other nations to be its dominant and most important one. The scope of a foreign policy or agreement of this kind is never confined to the mere words of the document itself. In the statement of a policy, as in the statement of a municipal law, the exact function and field of the enactment is determined: first, by the words of the document itself; and, second, by the

interpretation put upon it in one case by the courts of law and in the other case by the actions of the powers with regard to it. William H. Taft, then Secretary of War, speaking at Shanghai in October, 1907, said, "The United States will actively interfere whenever necessary to preserve the Open Door in all parts of the Chinese Empire." The Honorable John Barrett in the *Review of Reviews* for January, 1900, says, "The Open Door Policy means that no one or more nations shall enjoy any special or privileged rights of trade over others in China." Mr. A. C. Coolidge writes, "The Open Door Policy does not contain a single selfish theory but is one of fair play and it is advantageous to the Chinese."

This is what the Open Door Policy has come to mean in America. We shall now consider how other nations have viewed the Open Door Policy and the motives behind it. Charles W. Dilke, M. P., in expressing the views of the British Parliament in the *North American Review* of May, 1900, says, "A policy very similar to the Open Door Policy was preached by Mr. Burlingame, then United States minister to China, in 1868. It was a wise policy then, but in London it was premature." He further states in his comments, "The aims of Russia in the north, of Germany in one province at least, and of France in the south are different; but the action of the United States which has virtually arrested for the moment the selfish actions on the part of Germany and France, will, if continued in conjunction with our own, be strong enough to check for good the process of disintegration and division that had commenced." These,

together with many similar expressions by the leading statesmen at home and abroad, show clearly the spirit of the Open Door Policy. Furthermore, these views and expressions have never been repudiated by any nation at any time. We challenge the gentlemen of the negative to cite a specific instance where any nation at any time has ever placed any other interpretation upon the Open Door Policy. Therefore, we unhesitatingly assert that the Open Door Policy, in spirit at least, guarantees the political integrity of the Chinese Empire.

The issues upon which this question must be decided are these: First, has the United States any great moral principle to uphold in the Open Door Policy? Second, if so, is she justified in insisting upon it? Third,—and of least importance—if she does so insist, will such insistence be of practical advantage to her?

We believe that all these questions should be answered in the affirmative. The United States has in the Open Door Policy a great moral principle to uphold, for she is acting the part of a good citizen in the citizenship of nations. In the lesser citizenship of the country, state, and nation, a good citizen relieves oppression and tyranny, rights wrongs, aids the weak and oppressed at all times. In international citizenship similar duties devolve upon those nations possessing higher ideals of liberty and right. The United States can beyond a doubt render the greatest assistance and help to China by insisting that all nations strictly respect the Open Door Policy at this time. As China is in an unstable condition, both politically and financially, and lacks a

navy and an adequate army for her own defense, it devolves upon any nation, such as the United States, which is a good international citizen, to do whatever is within its power for her in her hour of need. Moreover, in so doing the United States would be but following up her traditional policy of good international citizenship. That she has always maintained such a policy can be easily proved by her actions in many instances, among the most important of which are these: She enunciated the Monroe Doctrine nearly one hundred years ago; she pursued a policy during the Venezuelan crisis, and in the case of Cuba and the Philippine Islands, which marked a new era in the history of civilization; she has been the foremost advocate of international arbitration and has submitted nearly two hundred cases to The Hague. At the close of the Boxer rebellion she used her influence in such a way that the powers did not exact an exorbitant indemnity from China. She herself returned to China all of her own portion of the indemnity except enough to defray the actual expense of the American expedition. She recently gave another instance of this by her unselfish action in joining forces with Argentina, Brazil, and Chile in an endeavor to bring order out of chaos in Mexico.

The action of the United States in these instances clearly proves that she is a good international citizen. Bearing this fact in mind we wish to picture to you an existing situation. There is in the Far East a small but powerful nation, sagacious, proud, ambitious for world power. Due to its peculiar situation, it cannot expand except at the expense of another. Extremely

militaristic in character, already she is extending her mailed fist towards defenseless China. But this is not all. Upon the Pacific Ocean lies the great highway towards future world dominion. Slowly, but with true Oriental patience, she is setting herself to the task of building for the future control of this great highway. Good citizenship is not her motive. Invested but recently with a thin veneer of western civilization, she yet feels surging within herself the old, old lust for power and position. China and the Pacific Ocean, the two chief centers of future world activity—which shall dominate them—the good citizen or the bad?

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, JAMES A. HULL, KANSAS STATE
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleague, the first speaker of the evening, has thoroughly explained to you the Open Door Policy, what it is doing, what it means as shown by the statements of leaders in world politics, and has proved to you that the United States is doing a just and noble thing for China in insisting that it shall be respected by all nations. I shall add more to the argument by proving that the United States is morally bound to aid China because of treaties and promises, because geographically we have territory close to that great empire, and because the United States has done her full share in establishing the many institutions of learning in that country.

What has been our policy? and what is our policy to-day? The people of the United States have worked

for years past in every way possible to place China among the leading nations of the world. We have been fighting—and alone—to maintain China's territorial integrity; and it was with this end in view that John Hay devoted much of his time and energy to this work. Honorable judge, can anyone be so blind as to see nothing but a selfish motive in our striving for this? Have our trade relations ever been such as to cause or to justify the United States, a democracy, in trying to force fair play from each interested nation merely for the protection of our trade? The very fact that this policy has accomplished thus far its fundamental mission of keeping China from being broken into pieces and divided among the powers, as would have been inevitably the result had the old conditions continued, places the Open Door in its true light. T. F. Millard in the book "China and the Far East" says, "Among foreign policies which have been applied in China with enough power to make them felt in shaping the broader course of events, that of the United States alone has taken a course which enables it sincerely to support the 'integrity of China' doctrine without being suspected of inconsistency."

China is a nation in which we have a special interest; hence we are morally bound to aid her. We are bound to aid her by all our good offices by the treaty of 1858, which was renewed in 1903 for an indefinite period of time. We are further obliged to aid her because every important proposal concerning the international status of China that was at once practical and sincere which the powers have been induced to accede to during this period

was promoted by the United States. Among America's good offices toward China we have: (1) The Hay agreement, acceded to by the powers in 1899, by which the principles of China's political integrity and of the Open Door were formulated into an international covenant. (2) The refusal of the United States to assent to the imposition in 1901 of an oppressive indemnity upon China which would have made her the fiscal vassal of foreign nations for an indefinite period of time. (3) The action of the United States in 1904 in inducing the belligerent powers, Russia and Japan, to confine hostilities to a definite region, in order to limit the devastating results of war upon the Chinese inhabitants, and to prevent further embroilment of China. (4) The action of President Roosevelt in using his influence to terminate the war between Japan and Russia, and to secure the definite assent of those nations in their treaty of peace to the restoration of Manchuria to China and to the doctrines of the Open Door and of "territorial integrity." It is chiefly due to the attitude of the United States that no nation in any treaty or agreement it has since made regarding Eastern affairs has, whatever its designs may be, felt able to omit a reaffirmation of the Hay doctrine. Thus it has come about that all important nations which are interested in the Eastern Question are on record in one or several conventions as favoring China's integrity and the Open Door. It may be argued, then, that a satisfactory course is assured; but the truth is that China is still confronted with a situation which threatens her national existence; and that the Open Door

is being evaded and undermined. Facing these facts, that the United States has done by far more than any other nation to further China's interests for China's benefit, and that we as a nation are the only people who can sincerely support the doctrine of "China's integrity" and of the Open Door without being suspected of inconsistency, we maintain that the United States is morally bound to aid this nation destined to sway the tide of affairs in the East.

Nor do I stand alone in this argument. Speaking at Shanghai in October, 1907, William H. Taft elucidated the American policy as follows: "The United States and others who sincerely favor the Open Door Policy will, if they are wise, not only welcome but will encourage this great Chinese Empire to take long steps in administrative and governmental reform, in the development of her natural resources and the improvement and welfare of her people. In this way she will add strength to her position as a self-respecting nation; may resist all foreign aggression seeking undue exclusive or proprietary privileges in her territory; and without foreign aid enforce an open door policy of equal opportunity to all." He further states, "That the United States will actively interfere whenever necessary to preserve the Open Door in all parts of the Chinese Empire." This policy as laid down by Mr. Taft aptly illustrates the difference between the American and what may be called the European position. America wants to help China to become actually self-reliant; some other nations seem to be determined that she shall not, and assume the attitude that her case

is hopeless and that she must remain a permanent international ward or be segregated into portions as parts of her territory now are.

We should have a voice in these Oriental affairs, if for no other reason than that we are geographically located there in having the countless islands of the Philippines under our control; and it has been well shown that they were involuntarily thrust upon us. That the United States has in an absolutely unselfish way influenced China for her good, politically, educationally, and morally, cannot be denied.

Honorable judge, it is most clearly shown that the Open Door Policy is recognized, not only by the United States, but by England, as our opening wedge, our means of entering into China's affairs and of aiding her as a sister nation in developing to that point where she can enter into world politics without fear of being dominated by a great menacing militaristic power. Richmond P. Hobson before the late House of Representatives declared: "America has been the champion of the Open Door Policy in China, beneath which lies essentially the same principles underlying the Monroe Doctrine, namely, justice to the weak, and equal opportunity to all; respect for the integrity of China and equal opportunity for all nations in their competition for the trade of China." He further states, "Japan has shown less regard than all other nations for the integrity of China. She has driven Germany out of China; and the probabilities amount to almost a certainty that Japan, now in Germany's place, will never dream of retiring herself." My

colleague, the third speaker of the affirmative, will show further Japan's treatment of Oriental countries, and prove the undesirability of Japan as a ruler of all eastern Asia.

And now, honorable judge, shall this nation, America, China's one disinterested friend in all the world, shrink from duty when she has the opportunity to restrain the menacing march of a militaristic power whose conquest of China would dispel for generations to come all hopes of the overthrow of war and of the establishment of lasting peace?

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, R. E. M'GARROUGH, KANSAS STATE
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleagues have advanced certain reasons why the United States should insist upon the respecting of the Open Door Policy. In continuing the argument, it is my purpose to prove first, that the principles of liberty and democracy are being threatened by Japan; second, that to allow Japan, a militaristic power, to dominate Asia will result in her ultimate control of the Pacific now controlled by us; and, moreover, that the United States should now take the first step in insisting upon the respecting of the Open Door Policy for the reason that at the present time there is less danger of war resulting from her doing so.

That the principles of liberty and democracy in Asia are being threatened by Japan goes almost without saying. More than that, Japan has recently directly vio-

lated in spirit, if not in word, the Open Door Policy itself. If Japan's actions continue, there is danger of further violation, because the Open Door Policy stands directly across Japan's pathway to the complete control of Oriental affairs.

We would call to your attention, honorable judge, the fact that on January 18th and on April 26th of last year, Japan made certain demands upon China, and that these demands, combined with Japan's recent actions, virtually violate the Open Door Policy.

The nations of the world were surprised that Japan would dare to make such demands. But Japan with her Oriental patience had long been waiting for this opportune moment. She saw that the powers of Europe were engaged in a consuming warfare; she assumed that China would yield; she planned to make those demands secretly, thus keeping them from the United States. But for once Japanese strategy defeated itself. Calculated to frighten the Chinese into giving away their inherent rights, an action which would lose for them the integrity of their country, these demands resulted in arousing protests from the Chinese and in exposure of the scheme. Yet, owing to the fact that China is practically defenseless and that great pressure is being exerted upon her, she has been compelled to accept some of these demands.

It is only a question of time until China will be forced to concede all of them, unless some nation or nations insist upon the Open Door Policy. These demands, if conceded, mean the ultimate control of China by Japan. If China agrees, she will give permission to Japan to

construct and hold some of the most important railroads in China. The Japanese will be given control of vast and valuable Chinese mines. The joint policing of China will lose for the Chinese their inherent prestige. China binds herself to purchase war munitions from Japan, her virtual enemy. China is to have Japanese advisers on all political, financial, and military questions. Japan is to settle with Germany for the territory which Germany has leased from China. We must admit that no nation can recognize such demands as these and hold its integrity. Especially is it a grave situation when we realize the traditional disposition of Japan in such cases. Allow me to quote, honorable judge, the following written by Putnam Weale, quoted by Gilbert Reid in the *Independent*, May 17, 1915, page 277: "It is also a fact, surely worthy of special note, that wherever Japan sets her foot—no matter how she may have placed it there and no matter what promises she may have given regarding evacuation—there she remains for good, making her tenure indisputable under specious forms such as the great Napoleon delighted in devising." Japan has already encroached on China. Korea, a country that had been paying tribute to China, was given her freedom at the end of the Chinese-Japanese war. The Japanese gradually took control of Korea until it was finally officially annexed to Japan in 1910; and this was done in spite of the fact that at the close of the Russo-Japanese war Japan promised the world that Korea should have her independence. Japan has been pursuing much the same course in China. Her people have settled in parts

of that empire until now those parts are practically controlled by the Japanese. Japan took advantage of the European war to get possession of Kiaochow. These recent demands are just the forerunners of the intended final step which is the ultimate control of China by Japan.

All this tends to show, honorable judge, that unless the Open Door Policy is insisted upon, there will be a "Japanizing of China." And does a "Japanizing of China" mean anything to us? Does the control of almost boundless natural resources, the rule of four hundred millions of people, does this change of power to her Pacific rival mean anything to America or to her island possessions? It means that to allow Japan, a militaristic power, to dominate Asia will result in her ultimate control of the Pacific now controlled by us. Japan hates us, and from her point of view, she has reason to hate us. Few Americans realize this. When the United States took possession of the Hawaiian Islands, Japan alone among the nations sent in a protest to Washington and this protest has never been withdrawn. When the United States came into possession of the Philippine Islands, Japan was angered, but owing to the involuntary manner in which we acquired them, she could say nothing. At the close of the Russo-Japanese war, the United States interfered and in the treaty of peace which was signed in this country, the United States so exercised her influence diplomatically that Japan was deprived of large war indemnities which she had expected from Russia and with which she had

hoped to defray the expenses of the war. In the recent California school and alien legislation, the proud Japanese have been classed with the negroes and discriminated against even more than they.

In taking up my second main proposition, honorable judge, I would have you note that Japan has virtually eliminated from the Orient all nations but the United States. As a result of the war with China, she obtained the ascendancy over that power. The Russo-Japanese war eliminated Russia. By a clever stroke of diplomacy Japan made a treaty with Great Britain whereby she agreed to care for the interests of the latter in the Far East, thus practically eliminating her. No sooner had the present European war begun than Japan's guns began to pound at the walls of Kiaochow and finally reduced that fortress, thus eliminating Germany. Thus the United States alone is left in the Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoa, and the Hawaiian Islands, all of them strategic points for the control of the Pacific. Can we doubt if the United States does not now take the definite stand in Oriental affairs represented by insistence on the Open Door Policy that Japan will lose in the future the opportunity for world power presented to her? Japan is situated geographically much as England is; and to be a world power Japan, too, must depend upon manufacturing and commerce. For both of these she needs and wants the control of the Pacific. The Pacific is now controlled by the United States because she holds these important island possessions. With the resources of China at Japan's command, a great navy and the control

of our island possessions are only a question of a short time. But by insistence upon the Open Door Policy now, Japan will be restricted to her rightful place as a leader in the Orient and not as the dominator of the entire Far East and of the Pacific.

The United States should now take the first step in insisting upon the respecting of the Open Door Policy, for at the present time there is less danger of war resulting. Japan is a participant in the great European war. She is so vitally interested in the outcome of that war that she would be most unwilling at the present time to engage in war with us, the more so as there seems to be a decided trend in this country toward greater preparedness. Our insistence would deprive Japan of the sole control of China's great resources and thus be of ultimate benefit to us defensively. This insistence will not necessarily involve us in a war. For almost one hundred years we have listened to the calamity cry of "War! war!" such as the negative re-echoed because of our insistence upon the respecting of the Monroe Doctrine, but no such war has ever resulted.

In conclusion, honorable judge, we have shown you: first, that the Open Door Policy is a thoroughly recognized doctrine; second, that the United States has a great moral principle to uphold in insisting upon the respecting of the Open Door Policy; third, that in following her traditional policy of good citizenship, the United States is morally bound to aid China; fourth, that the principles of liberty and democracy are being threatened by Japan's encroachment upon China; and

fifth, that to allow Japan, a militaristic power, to dominate Asia will result in her ultimate control of the Pacific, now controlled by us.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, F. H. DILLENBACK, KANSAS
STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: The speakers of the negative have told you that the Open Door Policy is too narrow to be of any benefit. We have cited them the opinions of leading authorities as to the scope and meaning of the Open Door Policy and we have challenged them to cite a single specific instance where any nation at any time ever repudiated this interpretation. If we admit for argument's sake that the Open Door Policy is narrow in its scope and that it is not being violated, as the negative contend, why not leave it in force? It will not require any military force to compel its observance. It will not prevent Japan from being the leader of the Orient. It will not threaten the policy, "Asia for the Asiatics." It will operate for fair commercial dealing within the small scope to which it is confined. No nation will care to violate it because little is to be gained by so doing. Then why not insist upon it to the extent necessary under the circumstances? The negative's whole argument on the military force necessary to sustain the policy is based upon the fact that the policy is not narrow and that it does secure for America something beyond a mere limited commercial advantage.

There are two possible stands for the United States to

take regarding the Open Door Policy. One is to insist upon its observance by all nations. The other is not to insist upon its observance. Which stand can we as a nation afford to take? If we abandon the Open Door Policy, we say to the Chinese, we withdraw our moral support from you in your efforts to withstand the aggressions of the Japanese. And we say to the Japanese, you can, so far as we are concerned, have a free hand in Asia. National honor and moral obligations will not permit us to take this stand. We maintain that we should insist with all means at our command if for no other reason than for its moral effect upon China and Japan. Insistence will save us from the stigma and defeat of withdrawal and abandonment. The Open Door Policy is an entering wedge and the only one that we have to prevent the Japanizing of China.

The gentlemen of the negative have made much of the point that for the United States to insist upon the Open Door would not aid us commercially. Honorable judge, we would call your attention to the fact that we have not based our main contention upon commercial profits accruing to this nation because of our insistence on the Open Door Policy, but on a much higher plane, that of good international citizenship. And we have shown you in so doing that we are acting in harmony with many other features of our past policy. Hence the contention of the negative in this respect falls to the ground. But whether or not the policy is narrow or broad, the fact remains that it is now being virtually violated by Japan, and that this violation does carry with

it an impairment of the political integrity of the Chinese Empire. Permit me to repeat the substance of the demands made upon China by Japan only last May:

Group I, Article 1, provides: The Chinese Government agrees that when the Japanese government hereafter approaches the German government for the transfer of all rights and privileges of whatsoever nature enjoyed by Germany in the province of Shantung, whether secured by treaty or in any other manner, China shall give her full assent thereto. Group V, Article 4, provides: China shall purchase from Japan a fixed ratio of the quantity of munitions of war (say fifty per cent. or more) or Japan shall establish in China a jointly worked arsenal. Japanese technical experts are to be employed and Japanese material to be purchased. Group V, Article 3, provides, in substance, that China is to have a joint police of Japanese and Chinese. In short, honorable judge, there threatens the danger that customs and duties in all parts of the Chinese Empire will be collected by Japanese officials, a thing in direct violation of the express terms of the Open Door Policy, and, what is more important and significant, a circumstance which makes of China a dependent of Japan. Herein lies the value of the policy as an opening wedge, for it furnishes America with a sufficient justification of a defense of China's political integrity. Samuel Blythe in the *Saturday Evening Post* of July 10 writes: "I know these two things, however. The Japanese will protest that they have none but the best interests of China at heart; but that talk is for consumption in the United States, Great

Britain, and elsewhere. The second fact is that if Japan gets this hold on China, the policy of the Open Door in China and the preservation of the territorial integrity of China, as originally proposed by John Hay, will cease."

Honorable judge, the status of the Open Door Policy in international law has been brought in question. The Oper Door Policy is not international law; it is the policy of a nation. For its validity, it rests on a sound principle of international law which is that national policies must be respected so long as they are just and fair and do not conflict with the clear rights of other nations. The Open Door Policy is such a policy and it is more for it has been agreed to by the other powers concerned.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, J. A. HULL, KANSAS
STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: The second speaker on the negative spent his entire speech in trying to prove that the great body of the good things from America found their way into China through other channels than the Open Door. Having thus, to his own satisfaction, shown the small effect of the Open Door Policy upon America's influence in the Orient, having limited it as it were to a narrow trade policy, he next proceeded to show that the trade going through the Open Door was negligible, and, in fact, not worth fighting for. We wonder that Americans and Chinese have been so long blind to the very small value of the Open Door Policy and are amazed that Japan thinks so much of it as a policy that insistence against her would require

a great upbuilding of the American army and navy. Has the Open Door Policy no sentimental connections? We quote from the *Washington Post*: "The United States is drawn into the Chinese situation both on account of treaty obligations and material interests. This nation objects to the absorption of China or the undermining of her sovereignty because such an event would mean the closing of the Open Door—the shutting out of American commerce." And it is not a fact that hand in hand with our missionary endeavor in China must go a disinterested helpfulness in political affairs. The Chinese revolution was born in San Francisco. China looks to America for her political ideals. What more fitting than that America should have a right in China to such a symbol of her principles of democracy and equality as is contained in the Open Door Policy. I quote from Coolidge's "The United States as a World Power," "The United States has a remarkably clean record in the Far East. It alone of all powers active there has never taken, or tried to take, one foot of Chinese soil. The reformers among the Chinese are ready to learn from Japan and imitate her, but not at all to be dominated by her; and against her too great influence they are turning to the United States." Yet the negative contend that China does not want our help. What of ourselves? Can we afford to dwarf our character as a nation by isolating ourselves from the rest of the world?

A. T. Mahan, the great naval expert, says: "It has been an easy but short-sighted policy, where it has been found among statesmen or journalists, to fasten attention

purely upon internal and economical questions, and to reject, if not to resent, propositions looking towards the extension of our national influence beyond our own borders, on the plea that we have enough to do at home—forgetful that no nation, as no man, can live to itself or die to itself.” Insistence would further implicate the United States, so claim the gentlemen of the negative. Yet we maintain that the United States cannot stand aside if she would and be unaffected by the fate of a quarter of the population of the world, a nation whose fate is recognized as a world force by all foreign nations. There is no need of building up a great fleet to enforce the Open Door Policy. Even in case we should have to fight we should not have to fight alone. Russia has lost land to Japan and would be anxious to regain her former possessions. England is interested in maintaining the Open Door in China, due to her possessions and trade there. France also would wish to defend her rights in the Orient. Even Germany in the case of the Open Door would side with the United States because of the Japanese seizure of the German port, Kiaochow. Even though we had to make preparation for war, we must remember that that is not the worst thing that can happen a nation. Just at this time we quote too freely Washington’s warning against entangling alliances but too readily forget his teaching about preparation for war.

Finally, permit me to point out to you a great inconsistency in the argument of our worthy opponents. One of the negative explained to you in detail the very nar-

rowness of the Open Door Policy, pointing out that this policy deals with a very small portion of China's trade and that in only a very few cities and that it can in no wise affect affairs in the East. Another of the negative speakers dwelt long on the horrors of war, the enormous toll of human life, and the utter destruction of the United States as a world power if she should insist that this policy be carried out. In doing this they have not only affirmed our statement that it has the power to influence the tide of Oriental affairs, but they have in this inconsistency turned upon themselves and destroyed a large portion of their own argument.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, R. M'GARROUGH, KANSAS
STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the negative have told you that Japan is interested in maintaining the political integrity of China. If this is true, how do they explain her policy of encroachment upon the integrity of the empire? The Japanese promised to restore Manchuria to China, and waged war upon Russia, who had practically taken control of this province; but in twelve years have not fulfilled this promise. Japan also promised to return Kiao-chow to China, but who believes that she will carry out that undertaking when she still retains control of the concession with an additional zone of territory marking the site of her military operations against the fortification in the earlier stages of the conflict? Why, we ask, has Japan never given Korea her independence? Did

her promise at the end of the Russian war mean as little to her then as it apparently does now?

Count Okuma, the present premier of Japan, is regarded as the leader of the peace party in the Japanese Empire. Yet note his acts in connection with the Chinese last summer, and listen to his statement published in the *Independent* for May 17th of last year: "The war will bring about changes in all things and in all countries, and it behooves all Japanese, great or small, to unite in striving that these changes shall prove to the advantage of Japan. Japan now has continental possessions and it is felt that China is powerless herself to maintain the integrity of her territory — a weakness which brings the influence of the powers to operate in China." Count Okuma is the leader of the conservative element of the Japanese people, yet in a single utterance he couples with a voicing of Japan's aspirations for nationality and empire a statement that China is a helpless nation and in need of a powerful friend! Would the control of China by Japan mean anything to China? Look at Korea, and ask yourself if that nation has benefited through the "friendly protection" of her Japanese neighbor. Korea is governed for the Japanese. Civil and religious liberty are a myth. In the *Literary Digest* for June 22, 1912, we read that "trouble has long existed in Korea over charges of a conspiracy to assassinate the Japanese governor general, Count Terauchi. It is said that about 6,000 persons, practically all Christians, have been arrested under this charge; and the Japanese are said to have put forth the extravagant claim that 10,000 in all,

which is practically the entire Christian church of Korea, are implicated in the plot." Further we read, "The missionaries insist that the Koreans arrested are in almost every case important leaders in the church. In Syen Chun all the Korean teachers of a missionary school were arrested and the school had to close. A church in north Korea saw all its officers arrested and imprisoned. It then elected new officers and they were arrested and imprisoned. When a third set had been elected and likewise dragged off to prison, the church decided to get along without officers." The *Independent* corroborates this testimony. It says: "We gather from it that the missionaries believe that some 6,000 members of the Christian churches in Korea have been arrested and imprisoned for months without trial, and that numbers of them have been tortured to compel confession that they have been engaged in a conspiracy to murder Governor General Terauchi." This then indicates what is very apt to be the actual working out of a Japanese Monroe Doctrine for the Far East—not "Asia for the Asiatics"—but "Asia for the Japanese."

Another great contention is that we, because of our unpreparedness, cannot insist that this policy be carried out. We submit to you, worthy opponents, this problem: If the United States cannot now stand as a world power, if she must stand aloof to-day, what can she hope to do in world affairs or for herself alone a few years from now; if we permit Japan to assume control of China as she has done in Korea and Manchuria, and organize a military power unheard of before, making

her mistress of the Pacific and a menace to peaceful pursuits? Frank Fox in his book, "Control of the Pacific," says, "The Pacific is the ocean of the future. On the bosom of the Pacific will be decided, in peace or in war, the next great struggle of civilization, which will give as its prize the supremacy of the world. Shall it go to the White Race or the Yellow Race? That is the problem of the Pacific."

Thus, honorable judge, this question can best be decided by weighing the value of the various arguments. On one hand we have the United States' position of a good citizen to be upheld and her prestige and national honor to be considered; on the other hand a chance of a remotely possible war. On one hand the assurance from seizure of our island possessions and the protection of our interests in the Pacific Ocean; on the other hand a chance of a remotely possible war. On one hand the giving of a promised and pledged justice to four hundred millions of people, who, if helped now, will always be our friends, but if neglected now will become the vassal and tool of our great Pacific rival; on the other hand a chance of a remotely possible war. Honorable judge, we leave it to you; read the balance and record the judgment!

FIRST NEGATIVE, WILHELM A. WUNSCH, KANSAS STATE
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: Before entering into a discussion of the Open Door question proper, it is necessary that we first explain

that an agreement has been reached making clear the meaning of the word "insist." It has been agreed to define the word "insist" to include insistence by armed force. It is therefore understood that if some nation should refuse to heed our protests occasioned by acts in violation, or in threatened violation of the Open Door Policy, the United States should do all in her power, by means of her army and navy, to compel that nation to harmonize her actions with the principles of the policy, regardless of the cost in money or the sacrifice in lives. Having this in mind, we of the negative maintain that the United States should not insist upon the Open Door Policy as laid down by John Hay; and it shall be my part in this debate to advance the first contention which we shall make in support of our case against such insistence. The United States should not so insist because the Open Door Policy by its terms and the manner of its promulgation is so narrow in its scope, so ill-founded as to its status in international law, and so impotent in its ability to reach the real cause of what evil there may be in the Oriental situation, that it would be folly for the United States to risk anything in insisting upon its strict observance, and that our only excuse for its retention is that it gives us a possible political advantage which we do not want.

At the outset of this debate, let us have a clear conception of the conditions and terms of the Open Door Policy itself. The Open Door Policy has three principal divisions in summarized form, as follows: (1) No nation shall interfere with any treaty port or vested in-

terest in its so-called "sphere of interest." (2) The Chinese tariff shall continue in force in each "sphere of interest" and continue to be collected by Chinese officials. (3) No nation shall discriminate against other foreigners in the matter of port dues and railroad rates.

It is evident, honorable judge, that in this policy nothing whatsoever is said about the entrance of American and European thought, teachers, or missionaries into China. Nothing whatsoever is said about the territorial or administrative integrity of China.

Naturally the question arises, with what does it deal, if all these important issues are excluded. The Open Door Policy, as is evident from its terms, deals only with trade relations. It seeks only to establish equality of commercial privileges of all nations. Furthermore, it deals not with all the trade in China, not even with all the trade within the "spheres of interest," but only with that part which passes directly through the treaty ports and over lines of transportation. When it is remembered that Japan holds only Korea and the northern two-thirds of Manchuria, that England holds only the port of Hong Kong and a small island, and that this comprises the sum total of foreign concessions in China, it becomes apparent to what a limited extent, and in what a very small and unimportant portion of the Chinese Empire the Open Door Policy operates in giving commercial equality.

We of the negative maintain that there is no need to insist upon the Open Door Policy because the Open Door Policy is merely a policy and not an international law.

It has never been signed nor has any nation ever agreed to sign it. It is a policy which the leading nations of the world agreed to follow providing all other powers concerned should do likewise. Treaties even are said to lack the basis of contract, the power of enforcement. Therefore, why need we insist upon a policy which is nothing more than a gentleman's agreement and not half so binding as a treaty. Might the nations of the world not well question our actions upon such a minor policy, when we have failed to give even the slightest insistence upon such important treaties as the Neutrality Treaty of 1831 and the Hague Convention of 1899, both of which have been broken within the last two years?

Secondly, by the terms and nature of the Open Door Policy, it cannot accomplish that which it is supposed to accomplish. It cannot prevent trade discrimination by any nation outside of treaty ports. China may buy one nation's goods in preference to another, and she may impose a high tariff and high transportation rates upon goods from certain countries and permit others to enter free, and still not violate the Open Door Policy. The policy cannot prevent certain Japanese political influences from operating in China. It cannot prevent Japan from taking possessions in China. It cannot prevent the entrance of Japanese teachers and influences into China. It cannot prevent the stimulating of China to trade with Japan in preference to any other nation. Japan at the present time almost entirely controls Korea. She has control of nearly all transportation systems in Manchuria. She has many teachers and military officers in

Canton and Shanghai training the Chinese in the methods and sciences of Japan. Japan has control of the Central China iron mines, the iron works at Hankow, and other important projects. She has just lately taken charge of Kiaochow, a very important holding. All these important steps can take place and still the Open Door Policy is not violated. Of what use is a policy when any nation can accomplish the very things it seeks to prevent without breaking the conditions it sets forth?

Now the affirmative can take one of two stands in regard to the violation of the Open Door Policy. They must say either that it is being violated or that it is not being violated. If it is not being violated, why do all these conditions which we have pointed out exist? They must be due to other reasons which the Open Door Policy cannot possibly reach. If it is being violated, the affirmative must still show that such violation is the proximate cause of the evils which, they point out, threaten or exist. Therefore, we of the negative hold that the Open Door Policy because of its very narrow limitation is impotent to accomplish anything worth fighting for.

Moreover, Japan need not violate any provision of the Open Door Policy in order to compete successfully and to the detriment of America for Oriental trade. Japan is nearer to China than are we. She can ship her products into China within two days, whereas weeks must elapse in the transportation across the Pacific of American goods. The Japanese understand the working of the Chinese mind better than any westerner ever can.

They are able to get nearer to the Chinese people. They know just how to prepare the different articles of trade to suit the particular ideas of the Chinese. The Japanese government gives great assistance to her traders by paying subsidies to her merchant marine, whereas the American government does not even protect her merchant marine. The Japanese people handle their own goods; while the American merchants hire either Chinese or Japanese help who care nothing about increasing a foreign employer's trade. Nor have we ships enough to haul our goods across the sea. We cannot even transport the materials from our own possessions. At the present time there is a million dollars' worth of hemp going to waste in the Philippine Islands for the simple reason that we have no means of hauling these products to our mills. If we cannot haul our own goods, how can we hope to haul exports to China in competition with Japan?

Now, the only other issue that the affirmative can advance is that we must insist upon the Open Door Policy to maintain ourselves as a political factor in the Orient. They cannot hold that our commerce, which is small and which we are making no efforts to increase, can keep us in the Orient. Therefore, they insist we should use the Open Door Policy as an entering wedge for our government to exercise a controlling political influence in the Far East. But, as a question of national policy, do we want to take such a step? We went far enough when we took the Philippine Islands, which we received involuntarily, as the affirmative themselves must

admit. That fact furnished us some excuse for their retention. To go farther, to attempt to maintain in Asia, as England has done in Europe, a sort of detached balance of power idea—is something quite un-American and quite beyond our willingness to concede. Why not let other nations bear their share of international responsibility? Have we not enough to keep our industrious minds busy in the western hemisphere? Why not let Japan enforce the Monroe Doctrine idea in the Orient? Japan's civilization has stood on the shoulders of that of China. Japan's philosophy and science are built on the Chinese thought of the past. Her art and industry are derived from the Chinese. Japan is fast becoming a civilized nation. She is the logical nation to develop China and to stand as the leader in the politics of the Orient.

Our idea, honorable judge, is "America for the Americans and Asia for the Asiatics."

SECOND NEGATIVE, E. F. WILSON, KANSAS STATE
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleague, the second speaker of the evening, has shown you that the Open Door Policy is impotent to accomplish any real or lasting good in the Orient, and that it is not to our interest to retain it for the fancied political advantage that it is said to give. I shall continue the proof for the negative by establishing the following arguments: first, to insist would increase the burden already borne by the United States in the Monroe

Doctrine; second, the United States is not bound to help China; third, insistence would require a virtual change in our foreign policy.

First, insistence would increase the burden already borne by the United States. In the Monroe Doctrine we now assume a protectorate over one-half of the world even though our military forces are admittedly vastly inadequate even for home defense. When all is said and done, there still remains to deter us from insisting upon the Open Door Policy one fact of paramount importance and that is that we should not insist because we cannot. Let me quote to you from the book "World Politics," written by P. S. Reinsch, our present minister to China. "In the great give and take of world politics, a nation no matter how strong, must, if it wishes to succeed, adapt its plans to its resources, and not expend treasure and blood in mere fantastic undertakings." Quoting further from the same source, "Whenever an opportunity or a plausible pretext to disregard treaties offers itself or whenever one nation feels that another nation is so occupied with other matters as not to be able to insist upon its treaty rights, the promises and arrangements contained in treaties will have very little restraining influence." In plain English this simply means that we must either abandon the Open Door Policy or maintain strength enough to enforce it.

Second, the United States is not bound to help China. There are no treaties which would call upon the United States to aid China in time of trouble. The treaties now existing are not offensive or defensive alliances but are

merely statements of the ways in which social and commercial intercourse between the two countries shall be carried on. No treaty agreements could be made between the United States and China which would be strong enough to cause the United States to spend treasure and blood in defense of that treaty unless it led to the definite and immediate benefit of the United States. When we consider that the American interest in the neutrality of Belgium, a nation much closer to the United States in blood relationship than is China, was not sufficient to compel our nation to "insist" upon the preservation of that neutrality when it was violated, surely we must agree that insistence upon the Open Door Policy, a policy not more clearly defined than American desire for the preservation of neutral rights, would not be in accord with our previous actions.

But, some people may argue that we are bound to help China in a number of ways, such as in an educational way. But insistence upon the Open Door Policy would not help China in an educational way for the education which China is receiving from the United States is not being carried into China through the Open Door. It is being carried in through the four hundred Chinese students who are being graduated from our American institutions every year by virtue of the Chinese indemnity money. If America really wants to help to educate China, let her do it by peaceful, uncommercial methods. America will never gain the confidence, respect, or influence of China by any means of force or insistence, but she will gain it by the steady pouring into China,

through unpolitical channels of American education, sympathy, and that intangible resulting influence which will work wonders with a people where force will fail.

Moreover, honorable judge, be not misled into thinking that because China is a weak military nation she has not a powerful latent strength which is soon to show itself. At this time in the world's history, when the powers of Europe are committing national suicide, when the Chinese people as a group are about to show their latent power, when Occidental power is at war with itself, and Oriental power is rising, shall we not take this opportunity to use peaceful means to strengthen Chinese good will toward us, or shall we continue to use a policy of force which would result both in the military defeat of the United States and in the partition of China, the very things which we most want to prevent.

There is no need for us to insist upon the Open Door Policy, for the United States is not especially bound to help Chinese development. China does not want and does not need commercial aid from foreign nations as nations. All that she wants is to be permitted to employ a few technically trained foreigners regardless of politics. I say that she does not want commercial assistance, in view of the fact that all concessions to foreign nations from China have been taken from her by force or by threat of force. "It was only in 1842 that the first five ports of China were opened to commerce, and that after a war with China in which China was worsted. The opening of ports in the Yangtze river was by way of indemnity for the murder of a British consular officer in 1847.

Others have been opened as a result of diplomatic threats, and still others as a result of the war with Japan. It was by force, too, that China was compelled to enter into diplomatic relations with western states."

That China does not need the political presence of the United States or any other foreign nation to aid her in commercial development is proved by the following examples: (These examples are taken from statements by P. S. Reinsch in his book on world politics and from statements in the *Engineering Magazine*, volume 46.) A decade ago the Chinese began the use of wheat flour. An American firm, the Great Northern Railroad, thinking that this meant a good market for our northwest wheat crop, built two of the largest vessels on the Pacific to carry wheat to China, and before the first cargo could be carried, the Chinese had developed wheat fields and flour mills which almost supplied their demands. Does this indicate that China is in need of American support or help? The Pacific Coast Commercial Commission visited practically all of the Chinese manufacturing concerns, and in nearly every instance they pronounced the buildings and machinery on a par with the best in the United States. Does this show that China is in need of American aid? The following is the method of accomplishing the internal development of China. A foreign nation furnishes the loan necessary for the construction at an interest rate of five per cent. The land is bought by a Chinese company and remains entirely within Chinese ownership. Of the net profits twenty per cent. goes to the foreign syndicate, while eighty per cent. is divided be-

tween the Chinese company and the Chinese government. In the face of these facts, where the Chinese are smart enough to best the foreigner at his own game and get eighty per cent. of the net profits while the foreigner whose capital it is that is doing the work is getting only twenty per cent., can we not see that the Chinese are able to forward their own commercial advancement without foreign political domination?

China has more coal and iron and industrial resources than any other nation on earth, and yet all of the coal and iron mines are entirely owned and partially worked by a Chinese company. All these facts, together with the government statement from Washington that American exports to China from 1905 to 1910 have decreased from fifty-eight millions to the paltry sum of fifteen million dollars, prove that China does not want and does not need foreign assistance.

Third, insistence on the Open Door Policy is unsound, for it involves a virtual change in our policy. We have always been regarded as a nation considerate for the rights of others; but the Open Door Policy, as you may see by examining the policy itself, is purely an offensive movement for selfish commercial gain. The first section refers to treaty ports and spheres of interest. The second section refers to tariff duties. And the third section refers to freight rates. This policy carries no moral obligations or sentimental connections either stated or implied. As we discuss whether this policy should be insisted upon or not, it is no place to bring forward a long list of moral obligations and sentimentalities which,

besides being incapable of proof, have no logical connection with the debate. Let me quote to you from a professor at the University of Wisconsin who says that "At the present time theories about China, about the alliance of the powers, and about spheres of interest, are both abundant and flourishing, but most of them lack the solid foundation of fact." It is a fact, however, that this is a commercial treaty as shown on the face of it. The question is, therefore, shall the United States, always accomplishing its ends by peaceful means, never engaging itself in entangling alliances, always considerate of the rights of others and confident of their own abilities to settle their own affairs, now go on record as an aggressive nation, using offensive movements for purely selfish commercial gain?

Honorable judge, I have endeavored to prove to you that (1) insistence would increase the burden already borne by the United States in the Monroe Doctrine, (2) the United States is not bound to help China, (3) insistence would require a virtual change in our foreign policy.

THIRD NEGATIVE, ARTHUR W. BOYER, KANSAS STATE
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '18

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleagues have shown you that the Open Door Policy is narrow in its scope and that it is unsound in theory. In further discussing the question of the Open Door Policy, it shall be my purpose to show that the United States should not interfere in the Orient in

order to maintain this policy because, first, it would be inconsistent with our previous foreign policy; second, it would be expensive; and third, nothing would be gained by it commercially.

In the first place, it would be inconsistent with previous American practice for the United States to interfere in the Orient in order to maintain the Open Door Policy. Our Monroe Doctrine keeps other nations out of the Americas. If we maintain the Monroe Doctrine, the United States must center her interests in the Western Hemisphere. Such being the case, she cannot consistently insist upon maintaining a policy which is so world wide in its nature. This inconsistency is being made more evident by Japan's attempt to establish in the Orient a virtual Monroe Doctrine. In this connection, Dr. Shailer Mathews is quoted in the *Chicago Herald* as saying: "Japan is anxious to maintain the integrity of China, and has developed a certain Monroe Doctrine toward Asia which has caused unfavorable comment in the European papers and has led to the statement that she is against the Open Door Policy. This is not true. Japan is interested in the development of China, but she desires that that nation of confusion be not a prey to other powers." In view of the fact that Japan is developing in the Orient practically the same policy that the United States is maintaining in the Western Hemisphere, we cannot consistently complain of it.

Along with the inconsistency of the Open Door Policy and as a result of it, the American policy in the Orient is so ill-defined that America sooner or later will become

involved in war by sheer reason of its indefiniteness. Mr. Norman Angell, the great authority on international politics, says that one reason why nations get into war is because their foreign policies lack definite character. Picture this situation. America is in possession of the Philippines. To that extent our Oriental policy does assume a definite and concrete form. But beyond that there lies but an indefinite fringe represented by America's activities in China. Does the Open Door Policy mean what it says or does it mean what the affirmative would have you believe it means? Does it guarantee Chinese political integrity or does it not? In this connection Mr. T. Iyenaga of the University of Chicago (in the *Annals of American Academy of Social Science*, volume 54, page 254) says: "I have to confess that I find it difficult to get a clear, intelligent understanding of the American policy in the Pacific, and am sometimes at a loss to know whether there is any definite policy at all. America has proclaimed in China the doctrine of the Open Door, but she has on her own part closed tight her doors against the Chinese. Is there one American policy in the Pacific for this side of the water and another for the other?" In view of this evidence, honorable judge, it is high time that the United States abandon instead of insist upon a policy which assumes such indefinite proportions.

Furthermore, it would be theoretically as well as practically unsound for the United States to interfere in the Orient because she would have to send the greater part of her army and navy to China. In sending her army

and navy to a country so far removed in order to maintain the Open Door Policy, the United States would weaken her own defenses, something which would make her an easy prey to her enemies or to antagonistic nations. Certainly the protection of ourselves is of far more importance than the protection of people on the other side of the world.

To prepare to insist would be expensive to this nation. Our present navy ranks third and our army consists of only about 86,000 men. To enforce the Open Door Policy to the point of insistence would necessitate this nation carrying on an offensive warfare nearly 8,000 miles from her western coasts. In order to do this, the United States would have to become one of the strongest military powers in the world. This would call for an enormous increase in our army and navy, all of which would involve an immense expenditure of money. To insist would be more expensive. In case of a war with a powerful nation, even if we should win, we should sustain great loss. Our trade would be injured, our ships of war would be damaged or sunk, our soldiers would be killed, and what would be gained? We should gain nothing commercially.

We have but little trade with China. We get but a small percentage of China's world trade. The United States has very little capital invested in China. Practically all the railroads and railway equipment in China have been built and furnished by British, German, French, and Belgian capital. In the *Engineering Magazine* (volume 46, pages 497-513), the manager of the Yangtse

engineering works in China is quoted as saying: "We have a small amount of American machinery in the works, but this came to us by way of Germany. American manufacturers have made no effort to sell to us. A bolt and nut machine which I sent to America for a few days ago had to be ordered through a British firm." This is evidence of the small amount of American trade with China. Again, Mr. L. R. Freeman in the same article says: "The Chinese people can successfully elaborate and are successfully elaborating the raw materials of which nature has given them so great a store, and it will not therefore profit foreign nations, and especially the United States, to endeavor to build up a trade with China along these lines."

China has vast resources which, when developed, will furnish an unlimited supply of raw material. She will be able to furnish the raw materials cheaply because of her cheap labor. Japan also has cheap labor. Japan is becoming one of the greatest manufacturing centers in the world, and will manufacture the raw materials furnished by China into finished products and sell them cheaply. China, with her four hundred millions of population, will consume the manufactured products of Japan. The United States can never hope to become a manufacturing center for China. The distance of the haul between China and Japan, and between China and the United States, differs too greatly to allow this.

The expense of a war in maintaining the Open Door Policy would be infinitely greater, as I have indicated, ~~than~~ the benefits derived from trade. Statistics taken

from the "World's Almanac" show that in our commerce with China, the balance of trade has ever been in favor of that country. In 1913 the balance of trade in China's favor amounted to more than \$17,000,000. Since the balance of trade is in China's favor and since we should be put to an enormous expenditure to insist upon the Open Door Policy, it is evident that our trade with China would in no wise justify the expense.

Also, by insisting upon the Open Door Policy, we should lose the trade of nations opposing this policy. Italy and Russia were the only nations which openly favored this policy. Germany and France gave evasive answers to the proposal of Secretary Hay. Japan, and even England, which advocated the Open Door Policy before the United States, said that they would declare themselves in favor of such a policy "provided that a similar declaration be made by the other powers concerned." We do not have their complete assurance that they favor the Open Door Policy. Neither do we have their assurance that they should become allied with us in case we insisted upon the Open Door; and should they become opposed to us, we should lose their trade.

Honorable judge, we of the negative have shown you: first, that the Open Door Policy is so narrow in its scope that it would be folly for the United States to risk anything in insisting upon its strict observance; second, that it is indefinite by virtue of its being unsound; and third, that we should be the losers if we did insist upon maintaining this policy. In view of this evidence, we cannot, in justice to ourselves, insist upon maintaining a policy

which was conceived for purely commercial purposes, and which binds us not at all, morally, politically, or otherwise.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, W. A. WUNSCH, KANSAS
STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: To support their broad interpretation of the Open Door Policy, our worthy opponents have declared that the Open Door Policy in 1900 prevented the partitioning of China. There are other reasons why China was not partitioned in 1900. (1) Sir Robert Hart's efforts on behalf of China. He pleaded for generosity and for China's sensibilities. (2) The position of certain viceroys in arranging with the foreign governments that no foreign nations should infringe upon those nations not taking part in the Boxer uprising. This brought about more harmonious relations later. (3) Generals and ministers of the Great Powers were convinced that partition was impossible. It would have required too great an army and it would have been much too expensive to occupy the whole empire. This last was the most important reason. The affirmative lay far too much stress upon the Open Door Policy when they would have you think that it alone was responsible for the non-partition of China in 1900.

The speakers of the affirmative have not been proving ~~that~~ the Open Door Policy as laid down by John Hay ~~should be insisted upon~~; but they have been arguing that

the Open Door Policy as they would like to see it interpreted should be insisted upon. They have asserted that the Open Door Policy has numerous implied moral parts and obligations, and upon this faulty hypothesis the most of their argument has been based. The gentlemen of the affirmative were unable to show any logical reason for insisting upon the Open Door Policy as laid down by John Hay and for this reason they were compelled to assume the existence of those implied powers which best suited their arguments. Treaties never contain implied powers for the simple reason that there is no higher tribunal to pass on them. What then shall we say of a mere policy?

The gentlemen of the affirmative have challenged us to cite a specific instance where any nation has repudiated the Open Door Policy as laid down by John Hay. Honorable judge, the burden of proof rests with the affirmative, and they have yet to show us where any nation has ever placed upon the Open Door Policy such a broad interpretation as has been placed upon it by our worthy opponents. The affirmative argue that there is no violation of the Open Door Policy and that there is no danger that it will be violated. To prove this they merely admit the negative contention that it is very small in its scope and show that it would not pay any nation to violate it because of that very narrowness of scope. Therefore, since it will require no force to compel a strict observance of the policy, why should we insist upon it even to the extent necessary to compel its observance

under such circumstances? A policy which is not worth insisting upon is not worth maintaining and should be abandoned.

Our opponents argue that the Open Door Policy has been agreed to by the actions of other nations, and in the same breath show us how Japan is violating the policy. The fact is that it is only a policy, and morally binding on any nation only to the extent that it enunciates a recognized principle of national law. And it is not a recognized principle of national law that one nation may not discriminate against another in the matter of import duties and harbor rates. The affirmative has enumerated a list of perils which beset China and they hold up the Open Door policy as the one vital remedy for all of these perils, but they have failed to show in any specific way how insistence would bring about these utopian ideas in China. They have failed to show how the Open Door Policy leads from cause to effect. There has been painted for us a dark picture of the awfulness of the Japanese aggrandizement in China, but nowhere has it been shown wherein insistence upon the Open Door Policy would prevent this aggrandizement. Japan could gain complete control of China without violating the Open Door Policy by simply granting to foreign nations the three commercial privileges contained in the policy.

It has been argued that the Open Door Policy may be used as an opening wedge in order to maintain the integrity of and prevent the Japanizing of China. How can the affirmative make such a statement when the fact

faces us that a large per cent. of the population of the Philippine Islands and the Hawaiian Islands is composed of Japanese; and further the fact that the United States has promised the Philippine Islands their independence sometime within the near future? Is not this retreating instead of advancing? And now the affirmative seek to justify the policy on the ground of good international citizenship. But, we ask them, what constitutes good citizenship, and how did the Open Door Policy make of America a better citizen than she was? A good citizen minds his own affairs and keeps hands off the personal affairs of his neighbors. That this is the American idea of good international citizenship is apparent from an extract from an editorial taken from the *Kansas City Star*: "The United States takes the position that it cannot with propriety express an opinion on the internal concerns of a sovereign state and that the Chinese should be left free to work out the problem." Again, we repeat, let the Orient take care of its own affairs, and America of hers.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, E. F. WILSON, KANSAS
STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: The second speaker of the affirmative has spent much time in an appeal for sympathy for China and in expressing the fear that after Japan has overcome China, the conjunction of those nations would prove a world danger. On this point let me quote a few sentences from Archibald Colquhoun, the eminent authority on

Oriental affairs: "Some claim these countries will unite and thereby become a menace to the interests of the rest of the world. If we take a better comprehension of the Chinese Empire, it will allay some of our fears. When China is regenerated, and that will take a long time to regenerate this one-fourth of the world's population, she will still remain China. She will not become a pale replica of Japan. It is notorious that it is one's next door neighbor who is most difficult to get along with. Otherwise why should England, who received so much of her own civilization through the Norman Conquest, have spent a large part of her natural life in fighting France. We are assuming too much in imagining that China will be a docile catspaw for Japan. China is wise enough to make use of the Japanese in every way, but she will never be enslaved to them."

The affirmative tell you that the United States is bound by treaty with China to exert our influence in China's welfare. Honorable judge, in our treaty of 1858 with China the United States promises that, "if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively, the United States will exert their good offices on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly feeling." Note the wording, "amicable agreement"; it does not say, "will go to war." The argument of the gentlemen is unsound. As a matter of fact, the treaties between the United States and China are not offensive or defensive alliances, but are mere statements of the way

in which social and commercial intercourse between the two nations shall be carried on.

Moreover, the affirmative argument is inconsistent. They call our attention to the long list of good deeds which the United States has done by peaceful means and at the same time they advocate the use of force. The gentlemen have dwelt much upon our moral obligations to China. Yet the United States has asserted her moral obligations by the Chinese exclusion bill by which the Chinese are prohibited from emigrating to this country. The Chinese do not want us to interfere in their political and internal affairs. This has been demonstrated by the numerous uprisings in China, the most prominent of which was the Boxer Rebellion. When China changed from a republic to a monarchy, upon the advice of an American college president, Japan, Russia, and England were the only nations which protested, while France and the United States, two of the world's greatest republics, made no official protest. At the time of the Boxer Rebellion, the United States, together with the leading Christian nations of the world, sent her soldiers into China. These soldiers robbed, murdered, and committed outrages upon the natives. Not satisfied with inflicting such an indignity upon China, these Christian nations imposed upon the poor, ignorant Chinese a war indemnity amounting to millions of dollars, of which the United States got her share. Has the United States performed her moral obligations toward China? The answer is self-evident.

Let me mention again the action of the United States in closing our ports to Chinese immigration. Does this not prove that we do not consider ourselves bound to help China when the giving of that help would in any way jeopardise our own prosperity? The use of force as advocated in the statement of this question would certainly jeopardise our national existence. Then, again, quoting from Blakeslee's "China and the Far East," "America, while taking a firm stand in favor of the Open Door in China, is now doing away with it in the Philippine Islands for her own benefit and that of the Filipinos, and it will be difficult for her to protest if Japan follows her example in Korea. To the Chinese the cry of the Open Door must often appear a hollow mockery. The door that is held open is theirs, and it is held by people who make no pretense of holding their own doors open any more than they want." That the Chinese realize this is evident from the fact that when it comes to a question of importance, China always goes to Japan. Did not Japanese statesmen draw up the present Chinese constitution? Were English, German, or American men asked for their opinion? The Chinese know the Western people do not understand them and their ways, and that they do not greatly care to do so. The Japanese, on the other hand, are Oriental and know just what the Chinese want.

The Open Door Policy is put in its true light by Professor A. C. Coolidge of Harvard University in his book "The United States as a World Power": "When China was on the verge of going to pieces, and other

nations had decided upon the partitioning of the Chinese Empire to the exclusion of the United States, this government saw that she had come in rather late to get a good share and public opinion at home would never tolerate such a proceeding. The only course left was to take up and echo the newly invented British cry of the Open Door. Rather ludicrous is the spectacle of the nation which had just voted the Dingley Bill waxing so enthusiastic over the justice of equal commercial opportunities for all."

Finally, the affirmative hold that the United States should uplift China and give her aid, even if the great country of America should lose its honor and perhaps its life in so doing. They fail to get into the great depths of the subject, but just catch a glimpse of the small things on the surface.

THIRD NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, A. W. BOYER, KANSAS
STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judge, Ladies and Gentlemen: The affirmative would have you believe that Japan is trying to close the Open Door of China by reason of her recent demands on that nation. The evidence does not substantiate such a statement. The points set forth in the Open Door Policy by Mr. Hay are as follows: That nations having spheres of influence in China will in no wise interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory it may have in China. That the Chinese treaty tariff of the time being apply to all merchan-

dise landed shipped to all such ports as are within said "sphere of interest" (unless they be free ports), no matter to what nationality it may belong; and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government. That they will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of its own nationality; and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to its own nationals transported over equal distances. I challenge the affirmative to show wherein Japan's demands upon China conflict in any way with these points of the Open Door Policy. Furthermore, Japan by her treaty with Great Britain in 1911 is bound to maintain the integrity of China and the Open Door Policy.

To impute, as my worthy opponents do, sinister designs to Japan, and to think that she intends to make China ultimately another Korea is ridiculous. They entirely ignore the latent strength of China and put a poor estimate on the intelligence of Japanese statesmen. Such an undertaking is not only beyond the range of all possibility, but would be to court disaster and ruin for the conqueror. Japan wants China for the Chinese, but she wants her to be a self-reliant, strong neighboring state, not a moribund one, powerless to resist the pressure and exactions of the European powers, for upon these conditions depends Japan's own welfare. No greater author-

ity in support of this could be obtained than President Yuan-shi-kai of the Chinese republic. This is his statement: "The supposed claims of Japan have been wickedly exaggerated by those who do not want to see peace exist between the two nations; and in the Western world the press has published widely that the Japanese are exerting and asserting political and economical authority throughout China. The government of the Mikado is conducting all business with China through regular channels, and in a regular routine, diplomatic and friendly manner. Japanese occupation of Manchuria is with our consent and with the approval of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain. It is not true that Japan has in any sense secured control of the central China iron mines, the iron works at Hankow, or any other mines or works within our territory outside the province of Manchuria. Nor have concessions been granted Japan or any other nation in the Shen-si coal fields. In truth China was never so well able to defend herself against internal and alien foes as at present." Surely if China herself says that she is able to defend herself, it is rank folly for the United States to insist upon the Open Door Policy as far as China is concerned.

Japan's treatment of Korea is exaggerated. At a recent missionary conference in New York City, it was shown that there are 300,000 members of Christian churches in Korea. Here, as in her own country, Japan grants full religious liberty; and the Christian religion has the same standing before the law in Japan as the Buddhist religion. The Japanizing of China has nothing

to do with the Open Door Policy. We might "insist" and still China might be Japanized, just as she might become Americanized. Insistence upon the Open Door Policy would not keep out Japanese influences, teachers, and military officers. These could all work in China, and possibly make a greater Japan of China without ever in the least violating the Open Door Policy. In the past twenty years Western Canada has become greatly Americanized, but that has not affected our trade. This argument therefore is irrelevant.

Honorable judge, we have shown you the narrowness of the Open Door Policy; we have shown you that we are unprepared to enforce this policy; and we have shown you that the Open Door deals with commercial privileges only. We have shown you that our trade with China would not begin to pay the cost of insistence. This debate, then, narrows down to this one issue: either the Open Door Policy guarantees the political integrity of China or it does not. If it does not; then, if we should insist upon maintaining the Open Door in view of the fact that our trade with China is negligible, the United States would be left holding the sack. If it does guarantee the political integrity of China, then the affirmative must argue that we defend China against foreign aggression. To say that the Open Door Policy guarantees the political integrity of China is to say that we have forsaken the fundamentals of our previous foreign policy — the Monroe Doctrine — in order to assume the protection of a nation not even in our own hemisphere.

Was this the object of the Open Door? The words of the policy itself contain the answer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE OPEN DOOR POLICY

Compiled by Miss Grace E. Derby, Assistant Librarian, Kansas State Agricultural College.

BOOKS

- Blakeslee, G. H., ed. *China and the Far East*. 1910.
 Coolidge, A. C. *United States as a World Power*. 1909.
 Latane, J. H. *America as a World Power, 1897-1907*. 1907.
 Mahan, A. T. *The Problem of Asia*. 1900.
 Moore, J. B. *Digest of International Law*. V. 5, pp. 534-52.
 Russell, Lindsay, ed. *America to Japan*. 1915. Pp. 282-293.
 Schierbrand, Wolf von. *America, Asia and the Pacific*. 1904.
 Pp. 32-44.
 U. S. Foreign Relations. Papers with Annual Message of the President, 1899. U. S. 56th Cong. 1st Sess. *House doc. 1*, pt. 1. (Correspondence concerning American commercial rights in China. Pp. 120-143.)
 U. S. Treaties, Conventions, etc. . . . between the United States and other powers, 1776-1909. 2v. U. S. 61st Cong. 2d Sess. *Sen. doc. 357*. (China, 1:196-291.)

MAGAZINE ARTICLES

- Barrett, John. *America, England and Germany as allies for the open door*. *Engineering Magazine*. Sept., 1899. 17:893-902.
 Barrett, John. *America's duty in China*. *North Amer. Rev.* Aug., 1900. 171:145-57.
 Barrett, John. *Our interests in China*. *Review of Reviews*. Jan., 1900. 21:42-49.
Commercial relations of the United States with the Far East. *Annals of the American Acad.* May, 1899. V. 13, suppl. pp. 105-160.
 Dilke, C. W. *The American Policy in China*. *North American Review*. May, 1900, 170:642-45.
 Dunnell, M. B. *Our Rights in China*. *Atlantic Monthly*, Aug., 1900, 86:271-77.

- End of the Open Door. World's Work.* May, 1915, 30:18-19.
- Foord, John. *Our Chinese Policy. Are We Shutting the Open Door?* Putnam's Magazine, April, 1910, 7:846-52.
- Freeman, L. R. *American Trade with China; Its Possibilities and Limitations.* Engineering Magazine, Jan., 1914, 46:497-513.
- Hart, Robert. *China and her Foreign Trade.* North American Review, Jan., 1901, 172:59-71.
- Iyenaga, T. *The Relations of the United States with China and Japan.* Annals of the American Academy, July, 1914, 54:254-59.
- Japan's Monroe Doctrine. Japan's Demands.* Independent, May, 17, 1915, 82:268.
- Japan's Purpose toward China.* Independent. April 12, 1915, 82:55-56.
- Jenks, J. W. *How to Extend Commerce in the Far East.* North American Review, Oct., 1905, 181:518-529.
- McCormick, F. *The Open Door.* Annals of the American Academy, Jan., 1912, 39:56-61.
- The Open Door In China.* Outlook, Jan. 13, 1900, 64:99-101.
- Our Duty to China and to Japan.* Literary Digest, April 3, 1915, 50:737-38.
- Political Relations of the United States with the Far East.* Annals of the American Academy, May, 1899, v. 13, suppl., p. 161-216.
- Secretary Hay and the Open Door.* Independent, April 5, 1900, 52:841-2.
- Shibusawa, Yei-ichi. *Japan and America.* Outlook, Dec. 22, 1915, III:994-97.
- Yuan Shi-kai. *The Chinese Republic Will Stand.* Independent, Nov. 22, 1915, 84:303-4.

•

SOCIALISTIC CONTROL OF PRODUCTION AND EXCHANGE

•

SOCIALISTIC CONTROL OF PRODUCTION AND EXCHANGE

YANKTON COLLEGE vs. HURON COLLEGE and
SOUTH DAKOTA WESLEYAN

Socialism, that is limited socialism, was discussed this year in the *South Dakota Triangular*, the three above named colleges participating. The debates were held on the evening of March 3rd, 1916, and, as was to be expected, the negative won in each of the three debates. One judge out of nine voted for the affirmative. It is difficult to get judges who will lay aside personal conviction and judge the merits of the debate on a question of this nature.

This subject was debated by Colgate, Rochester, Pittsburgh, Ohio Wesleyan, Oberlin, and Western Reserve the previous year and in the debates of the last named three a decision was dispensed with altogether and no judges were invited to the debate.

The question used was stated: Resolved, that Socialistic control of the means of Production and Exchange would be preferable to the present Capitalistic system.

The Yankton Speeches were collected and sent in by Professor C. C. Cunningham, in charge of debating at Yankton College.

SOCIALISTIC CONTROL OF PRODUCTION AND EXCHANGE

*YANKTON COLLEGE vs. SOUTH DAKOTA
WESLEYAN*

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, S. P. NELSON, YANKTON COLLEGE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: No doubt many of you have heard debates in which various single schemes or proposals were argued against because they could be branded as "socialistic." To-night, we of the affirmative are required by the wording of the question to support an economic system in which the factors of production and exchange are definitely labelled as "socialistic." We must ask you to bear with us while we do this. We must ask you to lay aside all preconceived prejudice against anything which even smacks of Socialism and consider the debate this evening solely on its own merits. If you are timid, if you oppose Socialism, then we would remind you that in all probability this discussion to-night will not hasten its coming by a single day or hour.

And furthermore, we would have you bear in mind that we of the affirmative are not advocating "socialism" in all its phases. The question involves nothing of its educational, religious or ethical aspects; it is lim-

ited to a discussion of the relative merits of two systems for the production and exchange of commodities. Through the word "preferable" it puts before you the desirability, or undesirability, of a different control than we have at present, of the factors in this process — land, when used to produce wealth, capital — economic wealth used to produce other wealth, and common carriers and other factors in the exchange, or barter, of the commodities thus produced. It simply asks if it would not be preferable to have these controlled socialistically rather than in the way they are controlled at present. Now, all our standard dictionaries define the term "socialistic" as "of the nature of, or pertaining to, Socialism." Since reference is made to one definite "ism," then it must be apparent that only in the proposals of socialism do we find just the interpretation to be placed on the question. Let us see, therefore, just what socialism proposes as regards the means of production and exchange — to which, as we pointed out, the question is limited. I hold in my hand papers containing twenty-six different definitions of socialism as applied to the production and exchange of wealth. They are taken from dictionaries, encyclopedias, prominent economists, the Socialist Party platform and the great International Socialist organization. Obviously, it would be impossible for me in the time allowed, to read all of them. They vary slightly, but all agree in two essential particulars: First, that socialistic control would be joint, or collective, ownership by the members of the community (meaning in this sense, town, city, state or nation as the case might be)

of the instruments and means of creating and exchanging commodities; and, second, a co-operative control of these instruments and means under a democratic form of government. In other words, it means *economically* — instead of individualism — collectivism; instead of competition — co-operation; and politically under a democratic form of government. Hence, as you will see, we are debating the relative merits of a publicly owned and democratically controlled system of production and exchange — the socialistic system; and the privately owned and privately operated system under which we live at present — the so-called capitalistic system.

And as a first step in establishing our case, the affirmative would point out to you certain evils in the capitalistic system — the system under which we live at present. I would call your attention to some statistics compiled from the Report of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations filed last August. This commission was established by Congress in 1913 and consisted of nine members — three representatives of the employing class, three of the laboring class, and three representing the public at large. It was, therefore, eminently fair in its make-up, and the names of John R. Commons, and Frank P. Walsh, who were members of the commission, further establishes the justice of its dealings. Furthermore, the statistics presented are based on careful and exhaustive investigations extending over a period of two years. The report reveals some startling facts regarding our country. We see from it that the natural resources of our nation are drifting into the hands of a

few—two per cent. of the people owning sixty-five per cent. of the wealth. Grasp the significance of these figures. They mean that our factories, our mines, our forests, our railroads—in short, all the means of production and exchange, are owned by a handful of individuals. By means of inter-locking directorates and concentrated bond and stock-holdings, more than one-half of the employing power of the United States is located in that little group of buildings in New York City known generally as “Wall Street.” That city boasts of three thousand millionaires, hundreds of multimillionaires and one billionaire. Yet in this same city (the wealthiest in the world) we see one-third of the children die before they reach their “teens” because of weakened heredity and unhealthful environment. Furthermore, we see the whole industrial system of our country laid flat on its back every few years with acute financial colic, during which time its affairs fall into a snarl of “bread lines,” “soup kitchens,” suffering and suicides. Periodically, factories are closed and millions of strong, able and willing men are denied the right to work. But, while men cannot secure employment, children are compelled to work every day. According to the report, there are over two million children working in factories for a mere pittance and under conditions too vile for description. There are, likewise, eight million women snatched from their homes and pushed into factories for long hours at starvation wages. Think of it! Men denied work; women and children compelled to work. We see factories closed down and people starv-

ing because the workers have produced too much — think of the irony of it. Thus, we have the spectacle of suffering in the midst of plenty. We boast of our “bumper crops” and our fabulous wealth — but what good does all this do the millions of men, women and children who are pressed to the extreme of bodily suffering — those ill-starred folk to whom “no coal in winter” and “no ice in summer” is not a fairy myth (as it may be to some of you), but a grim and awful reality. Reading between the lines of the Commission’s report, we see that there yawns at the feet of the working classes a menacing abyss of poverty and despair. Furthermore, with each year the struggle for existence assumes a more and more savage form. How do we know this? Let me call your attention to these figures, compiled from statistics of the United States Bureau of Labor and quoted in the *American Economic Review* for December, 1914: for the period 1900–1914 prices increased sixty per cent. This was approximately twice as rapid as the rise in wages. Thus, the purchasing power of the wages¹ received decreased from 1900 to 1914 by eighteen per cent.; from 1904 to 1914 by fourteen per cent.; and from 1906 to 1914 by sixteen per cent. Note that the most rapid decrease was in most recent years — 1906 to 1914, an average of two per cent. per year. Furthermore, as is pointed out in the article referred to, the average size of families was falling slightly (you will remember Mr. Roosevelt’s “race suicide” cry) while the number of women contributing to the family budget was rapidly increased.

But merely to point out the evils of the system without showing that they are caused by the very nature of the system is not a sufficient argument for preferring another system which is totally different in nature. It is, therefore, necessary to analyze the capitalistic system to some extent with a view of ascertaining the motives which lie behind it. Ask any business man, large or small scale, what he is in business for and if he is frank he will reply, "To make money. I'm running this business for profits." When the employer has direct control of the enterprise that motive is not a bad one, for he learns that it is a good plan to treat his workmen with consideration. But cultivate a system of absentee capitalism, such as we have to-day, and what is the inevitable result. A few men in New York, let us say, own a factory in Georgia. They do not operate the machines. They do not even go inside the door. Many of them do not even see the factory. They have some vague knowledge as to where it is located and they know that every so often somebody mails them a dividend check. Their only interest is in the amount of that check. They employ foremen, superintendents and managers to do the hustling for them while they spend their gains as they see fit. The same story is repeated with regard to our mines and other natural resources. A handful of sons and daughters of the idle rich thrive on the enterprise of the Black Hills of our own state of South Dakota without themselves turning a hand. It is the same with the railroads. Idlers who hardly know the names of the roads reap all the profits through their holdings of stocks

and bonds. They become aroused to their ownership only when the dividend or interest-paying date goes by without their receiving a check. Woe betide the managers if they do not wring from the enterprise, whatever it may be — railroad, mine, mill or mail-order house, an exorbitant rate of "profit." In the scramble to pile up profits for absentee owners who do not know a dynamo from a transformer a ruthless war takes place, under the name of "competition." Prices are juggled, wages are lowered, the hours of work increased. Each individual strives to win over his competitors and pile up more profits for his company or corporation. "Profits" becomes the very god of the capitalistic system and in their worship men's eyes become blinded to the evil they are causing, their consciences seared and their very natures warped. Here is a "market letter" issued by Charles A. Stoneham & Company, a well known Wall Street concern, on December 10th last. After boasting that the Submarine Boat Company will show a profit of \$10,000,000 in 1916, the letter continues:

"The Maxim Munitions Corporation controls what are considered the most valuable patents in the ammunition line, chief among them the model of the Maxim gun, so successfully used by the Germans in the present war. The purchase of these guns must be made through the Maxim Munitions Corporation. In addition, the company is preparing to make the various implements of warfare invented and improved by Hiram Maxim and for which, it is anticipated, there will be a huge demand. A glance at the history of the securities of ammunition

manufacturers evidences the gigantic profits and unusually high valuation for their shares. Such companies as the Remington Arms, Savage Manufacturing and Colt Patent Fire Arms Co. have commanded extremely high market prices. The Colt Patent Fire Arms Co., which is now selling at \$900 a share, has just been placed upon a fifty per cent. annual dividend basis. The prospects are as bright for the growth of the Maxim Munitions Corporation as any similar company." What is it that can make it possible for men to talk of schemes for butchering their fellow-men in such cold-blooded fashion? Don't you see running through this the finger of the god of the capitalistic system. "Profits," "increased valuation," "high market prices," "dividends" — those are the motives. And those are the motives of all capitalistically controlled enterprises. Evil motives can only produce evil results when they are acted upon. And the social and economic system under which we live is no exception.

When we see such heartless comment on methods for human butchery can we wonder that the same men have no concern over matters like sweat-shops, long hours, low wages, child labor and the exploitation of women? All is done in the sacred name of "Profits." Ruthless competition is the agent of destruction. And intense individualism is the philosophy which justifies it.

The first thing a socialistic control would do — and which alone ought to make it preferable — would be to change the motives behind our industrial life. Instead of an intense individualism which permits a Rockefeller,

a Carnegie, and a Morgan to levy an assessment on so many of the necessities of our life, there would be a democratic collectivism operated for the benefit of all. Instead of profits to the individual capitalist there would be service to the whole community. Instead of the ruthless war of competition, there would be the united effort of co-operation.

How these motives would work out in practice to make socialistic control preferable to capitalistic control will be revealed by my two colleagues.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, M. J. DE CAMP, YANKTON
COLLEGE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentleman of the negative has appealed to your reason on certain points involved in this discussion. We would do likewise as regards the main contention of the negative thus far. The gentleman who preceded me is an apologist. He is excusing and smoothing over the evils of the present capitalistic system on two grounds: first, that things are not so bad as they seem, and second, that much good has been accomplished under the capitalistic system. The gentleman of the negative has ignored entirely the contention of my colleague that the condition of the great working-class of our country is growing worse instead of better. He seems blind to a fact that is cognizant to all of you, I am sure, namely, that the cost of living in the United States has, within the past few decades, grown out of all proportion to the increase in wages paid to the workers. My colleague

presented statistics to prove this contention, but such statistics were really superfluous, for you all know that what I say on this point is true. Economists like Robert Chapin, Scott Nearing and J. A. Ryan have carefully investigated the condition of the working class in various sections of our country and the conclusion of each is that these people are not receiving what they ought to of the wealth created in our various productive processes. United States Census Bulletin Number 150 estimates that only one-sixth of the wealth produced is returned to the workers in the form of wages. Does not your reason tell you that this is not in accord with the importance of labor as a factor in production? We do not contend that labor should necessarily receive all the product, yet we do contend that it should receive more than it does under the present capitalistic system. And this disparity is inherent in the very nature of the present system, for it presupposes a social order in which the tools of production are owned by one distinct class — the capitalists, and used by another distinct class — the laborers. We of the affirmative are supporting a system which would terminate this divorce between the worker and the tools he uses. Socialistic control is the only thing that will bring about this salutary result, for it is the only system that can be devised whereby the users of the means of production and exchange become likewise the owners.

The gentleman of the negative likewise told you of reforms accomplished under capitalism. Granted that ~~they have~~ they have been brought about, we appeal to your reason

once more and ask the simple question: Were they accomplished because of, or in spite of, the essential nature of the capitalistic system? Is it not true that practically every step for the betterment of humanity as a whole has been fought tooth and nail by the capitalistic class? Witness the long struggle to bring about the much-needed social and political reforms in England at the very beginning of the system. Witness the awful cost of purging the capitalistic system of the evil of chattel slavery. Witness the combat that is raging to-day in all our legislatures to relieve the burden of wage slavery. My opponent has referred to the Keating-Owen Bill. Does he know that that bill has been opposed doggedly at every step by certain capitalistic interests? Does he know that they even went so far as to hire lawyers and doctors to say before a Congressional committee that the national government had no right to interfere in this matter and that, anyhow, it was better to have children in the factories than playing on the streets? The capitalists as a class are avowedly opposed to legislation that would benefit the people as a whole. A letter written by Mark A. Daley, general secretary of the Associated Manufacturers of New York State from headquarters at Buffalo, on December 30, 1915, urges the members of that organization to band together for the purpose of defeating proposed measures for the relief of evil conditions in the Empire State — such “paternalistic legislation” (he calls it) as minimum wage laws, employers’ liability laws and workingmen’s insurance. Yet it is a system in which reform is accomplished in spite of its inherent

nature, rather than because of it, that our opponents are supporting. Ladies and gentlemen, we of the affirmative prefer to uphold a social order in which reform is a natural outcome rather than an "exotic growth," to use a phrase employed by the negative.

Let me show you why a socialistic control, when put into actual operation, would be preferable to our present capitalistic system. I shall present my case from two different standpoints: first, that of the wage-earner, and second, that of the consumer. As I present my arguments put yourself first in the position of the wage-earner and then in the position of the consumer, and ask yourself this question: Would those conditions brought about by a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange be preferable to me?

Since it would manifestly be impossible for me to speak of every phase of our industrial life in detail, I shall select certain typical industries, and by applying the principles of socialistic control to these industries and by contrasting the results attained with the results under the capitalistic system, shall demonstrate the superiority of socialistic control.

The first industry to which I would call your attention is the United States Steel Corporation, in Wall Street parlance "the biggest industrial." My statements are taken from the annual report of this corporation for 1913. We select this time, for it was the last normal year prior to the outbreak of the European War. Just now, because profits are larger, conditions are even more favorable to the affirmative case. In 1913, the amount

of wealth created by this corporation over and above expenses, with the exception of labor, was \$518,999,605 — a tremendous figure. This sum was divided as follows: Depreciation of plant — 52 millions; taxes 13 millions. These items are legitimate deductions and would be made under a socialistic control. But let me call your attention to the next item: Return to stock and bond-holders \$247,000,000. But under a system of socialistic control, who are the stock and bond-holders? The public; for such industries would be collectively or publicly owned; and democratically managed. Under our present system, however, this amount went largely to absentee capitalists who own these stock and bond certificates and who in a great majority of cases live in places far remote from the actual scene of the corporation's activity. Contrast this sum with the amount which was paid to the workers. This total was \$207,000,000. Thus you will see that \$40,000,000 more went to the capitalists, those who merely held the stock and bond certificates, than to the workers, the people who actually created the wealth either by their labor or by their expert management. Does not this one case alone establish the injustice and the inequitability of the present capitalistic system, which my colleague pointed out? But let us look a little further. The number of employees was 228,906. Since this number includes all workers of the steel corporation from the president down to the humblest miner, we will consider only the average wage of the laborer, for we all know that the president and the other officials receive large salaries. The average wage paid to steel

workers, according to Professor Scott Nearing, is \$650. Now let us apply the principles of socialistic control to this one corporation. Instead of turning over \$247,000,000, as the United States Steel Corporation did in the year 1913, to a handful of capitalists, we could turn this item over to the entire community — the public at large — for they would be the owners under a socialistic control. The first thing that could be done would be to raise the wages of all workers to, let us say, \$900 a year. This is much above the average living wage. Now supposing that you as individuals working for the United States Steel Corporation and receiving a wage of \$650 on which to support yourself and family, would under a system of socialistic control receive \$900, would not that be preferable? Would not that system under which you received \$900 be preferable to the system under which you receive only \$650? But let us look still farther into the case. By increasing the average of all the 228,906 workers, including the president and the other officials, \$250 a year that item, wages, would be raised to \$265,000,000, but little more than goes to the capitalists now. But we would still have left \$189,000,000 to be refunded to the consuming public in the form of lower prices and better service. In addition to this amount last mentioned there would be added the sum saved through co-operation. With no competition between plants, large amounts could be saved by the curtailing of advertising, expenses for salesmen and the like. Besides this, we find that according to President Van Hise, of the University of Wisconsin, the United States

Steel Corporation, in addition to paying interest on its bonds and ample dividends, has put back into the business in one decade about \$500,000,000. Prices, he states, are as high as the traffic will bear. These sums last considered could be returned to the consumer in the form of lower prices and better service. Bearing this in mind, let me again ask you this question: If you as individuals were consumers of the products of the United States Steel Corporation would not this reduction in prices, this betterment of service brought about under a system of socialistic control, be more satisfactory?

But let us consider a few more typical industries, for our opponents may urge that one example is not enough. Time does not permit me to go into detail, so I will give you only those figures from their reports which show the amounts paid in dividends to the small handful of capitalists for their arduous toil of holding stock certificates. Consider the electric railways of the United States. According to the United States Census Report for 1913, 975 of them returned to private capitalists in the form of dividends \$186,000,000. Think what this item would mean if devoted to the use of the entire community? Would it not be possible to raise the wages of employees, reduce transportation rates, and in many cases to improve the quality of the service? To accomplish these under capitalist control, where profit is the goal, would take a long process of legislation; but under socialistic control these would spring spontaneously from the nature of the system.

I might continue this process of argument as applied

to all the great industries of our country. Everywhere you would find that vast sums which now are returned to the comparatively few capitalists could be, under socialistic control, returned to the people as a whole. This is true even regarding such institutions as our banks. According to the Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1913, the 103 national banks in the State of South Dakota paid dividends in that year amounting to \$670,770, which is over sixteen per cent. on capital stock. (Certain Eastern banking institutions show far greater returns.) This, mind you, is merely the sum paid in dividends, and does not include that part of the yearly profits which were turned over to surplus or left in the Undivided Profits account. We likewise find from the same report that the total loans and discounts of these 103 national banks was approximately \$27,000,000. The interest on these loans was from eight to ten per cent.—this high rate paid because the private owners of the bank were out after personal profits. But under socialistic control, the people as a whole would be owners of the banks and could be loaning money at lower rates. If the \$670,000 turned over to the capitalist owners had gone in lower interest rates, as it would under socialistic control, you could have borrowed money during that year for two and five-tenths per cent. less—in other words five and five-tenths to seven and five-tenths per cent., instead of from eight to ten per cent. Once more, do you not perceive the superiority of socialistic control as applied to this particular phase of our economic system?

Now consider this reasoning applied to all our cor-

porations. According to the Report of the Commissioner of Corporations there are about 288,000 in the United States. We find that the profits returned to bond- and stock-holders in 1912 was over five billion dollars. This money, mind you, went largely to but a handful of people—that two per cent. of our population who own sixty-five per cent. of our wealth. That, ladies and gentlemen, is the condition under the present capitalistic system. They are just bare figures, but they point us to a very definite moral. They show beyond the shadow of a doubt that there is going into the hands of American capitalists every year an unjust proportion of the wealth created, in the form of exorbitant profits.

We of the affirmative have called your attention to a system of control under which the private capitalization of these great industries would no longer exist—a system under which they would be owned collectively and operated under a democratic government. We have pointed out how the returns which now go to a few could be made to benefit the many. Once more we ask you the question: If you were to-morrow given your choice, which system would you prefer to live under—the capitalistic system, in which the few profit at the expense of the many; or the socialistic system, under which all benefit by the work of all?

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, E. J. BEYER, YANKTON COLLEGE, '18

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: Before continuing the constructive argument for the affirmative, let me review briefly the two cases in this

debate as they now stand. The first speaker for the affirmative pointed out certain evils in the present capitalistic system and showed that these evils were inherent in the very nature of the system. To this contention the negative replied that the indictment was overdrawn and that our social order wasn't quite so bad as we contended. You will note, ladies and gentlemen, that they merely asserted this on their own authority and the authority of a single economist. You will note also that they disregarded entirely the fact pointed out by both of my colleagues that conditions were growing worse instead of better. The other negative contention in supporting the capitalistic system was to the effect that reforms were being accomplished within our social order. Here again, they disregarded the affirmative reply that these reforms were brought about in spite of, rather than by reason of, the present system. The next contention of the affirmative was that it would be better to have the returns which now go to a few private capitalists in the form of profits, given over to the people as a whole and our second speaker demonstrated how this would be brought about by socialistic control. To this the negative have replied by ridicule on the one hand and by the contention that it would be contrary to our political philosophy to have the state become so paternalistic as to control our economic life. Once more, the negative are demonstrating how apologetic and reactionary they are in this discussion. It is true that the policy of *laissez faire* has become traditional in Anglo-Saxon political philosophy. And it is likewise true that each succeeding year sees more and

more radical departure from that policy. Half a century ago any one who talked of employers' liability and workmen's compensation was deemed either a madman or, at least, a dangerous individual to have in a community. To-day nearly all the leading manufacturing states have enacted such a principle into law. Whereas not many years ago the policy and theories of government took little account of the masses of the people, it is now a recognized duty of the state to care for them. And that care is being exercised increasingly in both economic and social as well as in political life. The philosophy of "each man for himself" which the gentlemen of the negative consider so wholesome is being departed from in every phase of our industrial life, for we are coming to realize that the corollary of that doctrine—"and devil take the hindmost"—is far too prevalent. The negative fail to grasp the great underlying significance of such movements as co-operative marketing, labor unions, farmers' organizations, and the like. But even they advocate a departure from the philosophy they pretend to cling to, for their first speaker spoke of minimum wage laws, income taxes, and the like as highly desirable. In other words, ladies and gentlemen, the policy of *laissez faire* is doomed to fall of its own weight, for society, through its agent the state, is beginning to think more and more in terms of the organism rather than the individual cell—to paraphrase a statement by J. R. MacDonald, a prominent British sociologist. And a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange is the only complete answer to this desire for co-operation

and organization. It is the only system which will bind society together as an organism in both the economic and political phase of life. The Anglo-Saxon has sacrificed his economic freedom to obtain political freedom; the German, perhaps, animated by the opposite philosophy, may have sacrificed political freedom for the sake of economic prosperity for all, by permitting an autocratic government to assume many economic prerogatives. A socialistic control of the means of production and exchange — the ownership and operation by society under a democratic government of the vast industries of our nation — will insure freedom in both the political and the economic fields.

But there is one great question which still confronts us in considering the question of socialistic control. Would it ever be possible to operate it in actual life? That we have reasonable assurance that we can — that socialistic control is feasible and practicable — is the third contention of the affirmative this evening. We base this assurance upon the fact that where it has been tried in part it has been so successful that it is reasonable guarantee of its practicability when placed in full operation.

Now we recognize that socialistic control has never been applied as we are advocating its application to-night. We are in the midst of a capitalistic system; and all attempts at socialistic control have of necessity been met on all sides by the forces inherent in that system, namely competition, desire for profits and individual aggrandizement at the expense of society. To illustrate: suppose a street railway under socialistic control — that is, owned

by the community and operated under a democratic government — seeks to carry out its motive of service to the people and to extend its lines. All the ties, rails, cars, every bit of machinery and tools by which it makes this extension must be purchased from private firms, concerns operating for profits which levy their assessment upon the commodities sold to the city. So with all municipal lighting plants, so with every single instance of socialistic control that is set down in the midst of a competitive, capitalistic system. Have we not good reason to believe, therefore, that such failures as have occurred have been due very largely to that capitalistic system rather than to inherent weakness in the idea of socialistic control? Furthermore, have we not reason to believe that when a goodly number of such socialistic enterprises thrive in spite of that system, that complete socialistic control — wherein all competition and profits are eliminated — would be completely successful? And a corollary to this thought is as follows: since socialistic control has never been tried in its complete sense but only as single enterprises in the midst of the capitalistic system, the negative cannot say that it would be impracticable because they have no complete experience to judge from.

Lack of time prevents an exhaustive consideration of the subject of the success of socialistic enterprises, but we wish to consider briefly two or three. Kansas City, Kansas, has taken over its electric light plant and is furnishing electricity to its patrons for three cents per kilowatt hour, besides paying operating expenses, interest and creating a sinking fund for the retirement of the bonds

issued for the establishment of the municipal plant. Pasadena, California, likewise furnishes electricity for five cents per kilowatt hour, and besides has taken several hundred thousand dollars into the city treasury from the plant, which is being used in the improvement of schools, parks, and the reduction of taxation. - San Francisco, Haverhill, Massachusetts, Chicago, New York, Detroit, Milwaukee—and scores of other municipalities, are operating municipal plants along various lines and with a degree of success greater than the most sanguine predicted when they began this work. They are examples of socialistic control because the motive behind it all is service to the community and not profits to the individual, and the control is by the city, a democratic government. In other words, in these instances there is being done on a small scale just what my colleagues said could be done under socialistic control. The list could be greatly extended, but the point we wish to make is this — that these have been successful in the midst of a competitive, capitalistic system, where all materials, tools, and machinery have come from profit-seeking companies. Does it not give reasonable assurance that under a complete system of socialistic control, where the motive that pervades the entire system would be service not profit, all such enterprises would be successful?

But there is one example of socialistic control on an even larger scale that has been a remarkable success. We refer now to the Panama Canal Zone. Remember, we are not considering the success or failure of the project itself, but rather those enterprises that attended the actual

digging. It was an enterprise of socialistic control entirely. In digging the canal our government (a democratic government), built, owned and operated railroads, hotels, department stores, electric power houses, opera houses,—in fact, everything necessary to conduct the work and provide comfort and pleasure for the eighty thousand government employees there. All of these things were done without loss to the government financially and at the same time in spite of the extra cost of transportation to the Zone, prices were lower than we were paying in the United States. Why? There were no profits to be paid to private stockholders. Furthermore, if the government had done its own producing of these commodities—thereby avoiding the payment of profits to corporations from which it bought the goods—the saving would have been much greater. In just a word, the United States Government, through experts, successfully ran a complete little world of its own along the lines of socialistic control in the Canal Zone. Why should we not be reasonably sure that it would be equally successful upon a larger scale in the United States?

But in considering the potential success of socialistic control it is not necessary to confine ourselves to the United States only. Germany affords us an illustration that demonstrates its practicability. Now, we recognize the essential difference between the German Government and our own. The German Government is autocratic; ours is democratic. We recognize also that many changes in our own government might be necessary to handle its greater responsibility, as, for instance, our fiscal policy.

Those provisions would simply accompany the change to socialistic control from capitalistic control. But, if socialistic control will operate for the benefit of the whole people under an autocratic government, how much more ought it to work for the benefit of the whole people under a democratic government? If the negative undertake to deny this contention, a heavy burden of proof falls upon them. For they must show that a democratic government is not the best that can be devised to serve the whole people, and that an autocratic government can do it better.

Now whatever may be our opinions concerning Germany's military policy, we must certainly admit the remarkably high efficiency of her social and economic policy. The Germany of fifty years ago gave no suggestion of the present empire which challenges the world for supremacy. Yet her cities have shown a great development, her population has increased by leaps and bounds, wonderful progress has been made in agriculture along scientific lines, her per-acre production greatly surpassing that of the United States. Industry has been rapidly expanding. Her foreign trade has reached colossal proportions in a few years' time. Germany's prosperity has also been accompanied by an increase in the wealth and standard of living of all classes. The last twenty-five years have seen an increase of four hundred per cent. in savings bank deposits, ninety-two per cent. of which are in public institutions. Wages have risen in some cases as much as two hundred per cent. And this enviable accomplishment, this remarkable advance of an entire nation,

has come under a system of state control of the means of production and exchange. All forms of transportation are in the hands of the state—the telegraph, telephone, mail, express, nine-tenths of the railroads, and also forests, farms, factories and mines. The capital value of enterprises owned and operated by the state is six and a half billion dollars and the net returns to the state amount to more than two hundred and seventy-seven million dollars. Concerning this policy, no less an authority than Frederick C. Howe says that instead of a struggle on the part of stock-holders and directors to secure the maximum of profits and dividends, the struggle of the state officials and chambers of commerce is to secure the maximum of service, either in accommodation to the public or in returns to the state. Such, ladies and gentlemen, is the situation we find in Germany to-day. A great state of commanding industrial, commercial and agricultural importance has been raised. A challenging empire has been placed upon promising foundations through the efficacy of a system of state control of the means of production and exchange.

What bearing has this upon the question we are discussing, do you ask? Simply this: if such progress can be accomplished for the benefit of all the people under a socialized state governed by an autocracy, then we believe that as great, or greater, good can be accomplished for the benefit of all under a democracy. But if Germany's progress could only be approximated under a system of socialistic control in the United States, even then we maintain that it would be preferable to the present cap-

italistic system, which is benefitting the few at the expense of the many. And if the negative say that Germany's success is no criterion by which to judge conditions in the United States, then, as we said before, the burden of proof becomes theirs.

But even in the United States we see on every hand the superiority of co-operation and service over competition and profit-seeking. In spite of efforts to maintain the competitive feature of the capitalistic system, the tendency is toward combination. The growth of trusts and monopolies is an evidence of this. The trouble is that now the combination is for the benefit of the few; under socialistic control—collective ownership and democratic management—it would be for the benefit of all. If trusts and monopolies were owned by all the people we would have pure socialistic control, and the benefits of organization would accrue to them. If co-operation is practicable for the capitalists why not for the whole people? The year 1915 saw twenty-one railroads in the hands of government receivers—one-half of the total railroad mileage of the United States. The same year saw 16,073 business failures. Here are private enterprises gone to smash that the government, under the bankruptcy law, must take over and operate. If the government through receivers can run railroads and corporations for the benefit of stockholders after these industries have been wrecked by greedy capitalists—which it does time and time again—why should it be impracticable for the government to run railroads, corporations, factories,

mines, for the benefit of all the people? If the government can be trusted with the last word in the regulation of commerce and industry, as the gentlemen of the negative advocate as an alternative to socialistic control, why can it not be trusted with the task of carrying out its orders? If it is practicable for the government to monopolize the transmission of the mails, why is it impracticable for the government to monopolize the production and transportation of the necessities of life? Is the food supply safer in the hands of private capitalists than in the hands of the government?

In conclusion, we have approached this subject with the view of presenting the defects of the present capitalistic system and of also presenting a system which we believe to be preferable. We believe that in doing this we have drawn no unwarranted conclusions, but have been fair-minded in our indictment of the capitalistic system and fair in our advocacy of socialistic control. We have shown that socialistic control would supplant base motives by noble motives, that it would work to the benefit of all the people. We have shown that we have reasonable assurance that socialistic control would be practical and satisfactory in actual operation, by pointing to its success on a small scale in the United States in spite of the capitalistic system, and on a large scale at the Canal Zone and in Germany. And any one of these, we believe you will agree, is sufficient reason for saying that a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange would be preferable to the present capitalistic system.

AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, E. J. BEYER, YANKTON, '18

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The leader of the negative has confessed that the outcome of this discussion hinges upon two main issues: He says, if we could rid the present social order of the evils which exist it would be wholly desirable. He likewise says, that unless you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that socialistic control is practicable you cannot prefer it to the present system. We deduce the first issue to be, therefore: Can the evils in our social order be eradicated without changing the essential nature of the system? The negative maintain that they can — that they are being eradicated to-day. Let me remind you once more that in so far as this process is operating it is doing so in spite of, and not by reason of, the nature of the capitalistic system. And, ladies and gentlemen, there are certain fundamental reasons why the proposal to have the state merely interfere in the conduct of private enterprise can never be wholly successful. In the first place, it is theoretically unsound. It implies peace between the public and the corporation. Our opponents are in this respect like those who cry, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace!" In practice there is one continual fight between the public and the corporation. You cannot alter the fact that private concerns do business for profit — and as much profit as they can get. Selfishness, desire for gain — these are motives that will forever make government regulation inefficient and in the end unsatisfactory. You cannot regulate life by law; in the final analysis, for last-

ing goodness, the spirit must be right, the motive pure, the foundation upon which a social order is based one of rock and not of sand. But the spirit of the capitalistic system is wrong—the few are seeking forever to profit at the expense of the many. Its motive is base—it seeks profits,—gold, dividends! Its foundation is insecure—it is based on the assumption that there must be forever a divorce between the instruments of production and those who use them. The negative cry out against corruption in our politics—but what is one of the chief sources of corruption? Is it not the influence of the privilege-seeking corporations? Do they not influence the appointment to commissions? Do they not bribe our legislators? Do they not control public sentiment by owning the press? The corporations are enthusiastic for more government regulation—in fact, they insist upon it. The more commissions there are the better the chance to buy privileges! What a godsend was the dissolution of the Oil and Tobacco Trusts! What a godsend to the owners of these trusts—for are not the public paying more to-day for the products of those concerns than they did before they were “busted”? How much better it would have been to apply the principle of socialistic control to these corporations—to take them over and operate them for the benefit of all the people! Ladies and gentlemen, government control—anything short of government ownership and operation—is and always will be inadequate, for it does not get at the root of the trouble. To patch up any one of the hundreds of evils and leave the source untouched is folly. Suppress one evil and another will break forth

—increase wages and the cost of living is raised; improve tenements and rents are made higher; lower rates and service is cheapened. For every evil suppressed a new and greater one will break forth. As Samuel Blythe says: "They get the public going and coming!" This is inevitable so long as you keep patching up the old garment. A new garment is needed. That new garment, that only final and adequate solution, is this: instead of private ownership—public ownership; instead of government regulation—government operation; instead of the present capitalistic system—a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange. On the first issue of this debate you are driven, whether you will or not, to the inevitable conclusion that you cannot rid the present social order of its evils without going directly to the heart of the whole matter and changing the very nature of our economic system. The gentlemen of the negative are fighting hard for the continuation of the old; but the new will come, in spite of all they say, and when it does come it will be more satisfactory, for it will have supplanted base motives by pure, an evil spirit by a good, and a crumbling foundation—a society existing at cross purposes, with a firm foundation—a society welded together for the good of all.

Would socialistic control be practicable? We of the affirmative cannot prove this point conclusively. Socialistic control has never been tried in its complete form. But, mind you, neither can the negative prove conclusively that it will not be successful! And, ladies and gentlemen, when we see specific instances of socialistic

control thriving in spite of capitalism on both a large and small scale we believe we have reason to believe that it will prove feasible and practicable. We have shown you such instances. When the negative deny that it is workable, then the burden of proof becomes theirs. When George Stephenson was working on his invention of the steam engine, certain pundits in the scientific and philosophical field proved to their own satisfaction that the steam engine was a physical impossibility. On the day it made its first successful trip, a speaker before a certain London scientific society demonstrated conclusively that it would not go. You perceive the force of this analogy? I would merely suggest that the gentlemen of the negative may be in such a position as regards this question of the practicability of socialistic control.

Throughout the course of their argument you heard a great deal regarding human nature. You were told that men were inherently evil—they never could be much better than they are to-day. We wish that the gentlemen of the negative had been a little more exact in their terms. Did they mean human nature, or human habit? Why do we have certain lusts? Why do men scramble over each other and disregard each other's rights? Is it not because they are compelled by the inherent nature of our economic system to do so? It is that philosophy of each man for himself and devil-take-the-hindmost! Just as long as men are compelled to fight tooth and nail for the very means of existence—for food, for clothing and for shelter—we cannot expect them to be motivated by noble impulses and guided by

the law of love in their relations with their fellow men. But change that economic condition, insure to every man a sufficiency of the necessities of life, and you have gone a long way towards changing the attributes which will distinguish men in their mutual relations. It is pretty generally agreed that morality is largely a product of environment. We acknowledge that our opponents are right when they say that just now men are selfish and base, and we maintain that they never can be much better so long as their environment is such as it is. This is simply another reason why we urge socialistic control, for it would change that environment and give men a chance to develop a morality upon a higher plane.

And now, in the closing moments of this debate, let us consider the merits of the two cases as presented. We of the affirmative have endeavored to be precise and scientific in our presentation of our case. We have presented statistical evidence which shows that the present capitalistic system is inequitable and unjust. The very fact that the gentlemen of the negative have proposed specific remedies shows that they, too, recognize its injustice. But, as I have pointed out, there are many reasons why the measures advocated by our opponents can never be wholly effective. We are driven to the conclusion that the only entirely satisfactory method is to change the motives back of our economic life. This we have shown that socialistic control would do. We then indicated how these motives applied to our industries would be beneficial to both wage-earner and consumer. The negative have objected to this part of our case on

the ground that socialistic control might be inefficient, because of political corruption and unbusinesslike methods. But we would remind you that this corruption is largely due to the inherent nature of the capitalistic system, and that unbusinesslike methods would be supplanted by better means as the scope of government enterprise was widened. Was Colonel Goethal's conduct of affairs at the Canal Zone unbusinesslike? Yet this was socialistic control purely, in that it was government work supervised by an expert; and are we not warranted in believing that the government could find just as efficient men as managers, superintendents and foremen as the owners of large-scale enterprises do now, if the competition of many bidders was eliminated? But even if these objections were valid, even if socialistic control were only one-third as efficient as capitalistic control, we maintain that still it would be better to have this control exercised for the benefit of all instead of for the benefit of a few. Yes, and even if the most pessimistic viewpoint prevailed, and socialistic control were only one-tenth as efficient, still we maintain that by just that degree it would be preferable to the capitalistic system. That sum of five billion dollars which to-day goes to private pocketbooks, even if it were reduced to only half a billion, would better be going to the people as a whole!

Thus, we see that unless the negative have shown that a desire for private profit is better than a desire for public service, unless they have shown that it is better to enrich the few rather than benefit the many, unless they have shown that democratic government is an utter

failure as the manager of business enterprises, they have not shown that socialistic control is not preferable to the present capitalistic system.

HURON COLLEGE vs. YANKTON COLLEGE

FIRST NEGATIVE, R. E. WALZ, YANKTON COLLEGE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: In the debate this evening we of the negative have no intention of quarreling with the gentlemen of the affirmative over the meaning of the question. We acknowledge that we are not debating the subject of Socialism in all its aspects. The gentlemen of the affirmative were good enough to define the question carefully for you and we accept their conclusions as the basis of our discussion this evening.

There are, however, two things which we want you to bear carefully in mind. You heard our opponent draw a tremendous indictment against the present capitalistic system of controlling the means of production and exchange. But we want you to remember that we cannot conceive of either system in its ideal aspect. The ideal of the capitalistic system is just as good as the ideal of the socialistic system. If all capitalists gave their employees just wages, if all capitalists were careful of the welfare of their employees in every way, if all capitalists were Henry Fords, then there would be no reason ~~what-~~
~~ever~~ for dissatisfaction with the capitalistic system. ~~But,~~ unfortunately, this is not the case. Injustice and ~~inequality~~ creep in — as the affirmative have so drastically

pointed out. And this is true simply because human nature is such as it is. Men have certain lusts; they are greedy for wealth and power; they do not hesitate to trample over the rights of their fellowmen to gain this power. In just a word—human nature is human nature, far from perfect, far from being ideal. But, in order to make the discussion this evening a real debate, we must consider human nature as it is. We cannot admit that certain revolutionary changes have taken place which make human nature any different under socialistic control from what it is under the capitalistic system. To acknowledge this, would be to grant the affirmative victorious without a contest of any kind. Or, to regard the matter from the other standpoint, to think of human nature as revolutionized would make the capitalistic system likewise ideal—and there would be no discussion at all. Hence, bear this in mind,—we are thinking of human nature as it is.

Again, you will note from the analysis of the question by our opponents that the great distinguishing feature between the capitalistic system and the socialistic system is that under the first our means of production and exchange are privately owned and privately operated; while under the second they are publicly owned and publicly operated. In other words, the point at which the capitalistic system is done away with and the socialistic system comes into being is the actual transfer of control from private to public hands, as regards both ownership and operation. Hence, any modification in our system of production and exchange is still the present capitalistic

system up to the point at which the ownership and control is changed from private hands to public, or state, or government hands.

With these two points fixed in mind, viz.: that we must think of human nature as it is, and that any modification up to the point of actual public ownership is still the capitalistic system, let us proceed with the discussion.

Now in order to justify any change from this system of private control to one of public, or socialistic control, it is necessary first of all to draw an indictment against the former system. This the gentlemen of the affirmative have done. This all advocates of socialistic control do with great vehemence. And the indictment drawn is a serious one. We certainly cannot consider perfect any social order against which such charges can be laid with even a grain of truth. Thus, the very fact that it is the imperfections of the present system which are the basis for the affirmative advocating a new system emphasizes the point I made a few minutes ago — namely, that we cannot in fairness consider either the socialistic or the capitalistic system in its ideal form. The indictments drawn against the present system, therefore, are weakened by the very fact that indictments can be, and will be, drawn against the socialistic system. But that is not all. The indictment drawn by advocates of socialistic control is one-sided and exaggerated. It looks down, not up. It carefully selects the weak spots in our system and emphasizes them to the neglect of the strong. When we listen to the charges brought against our present system, we have to ask ourselves: Is there not a ray

of light in the midst of all this blackness? Are conditions as dark as the gentlemen would have us believe? And when we give the matter careful consideration, we have to acknowledge that the picture is not so awful as it has been painted. As Doctor Skelton, professor of political science in Queen's University, Canada, points out: "The Socialist directs his shafts against a mythical extreme individualism, ignoring the restraining social forces implicit in the existing order; forces fully as characteristic as the scope and play which in the main are permitted to individual ambition and individual initiative. He has thrown the undivided blame for all the world's misery and failure on social institutions, on the tools men use, rather than on the limitations of the purely human men who use them." In other words, the indictment drawn by our opponents against the present system is weakened by two factors: first, a counter-indictment can be, and will be, drawn against the socialistic system; second, their indictment is exaggerated and overdrawn.

But there is a great deal of truth in what the gentlemen say about the shortcomings of the present system. It is true that we do have such evils as concentration of wealth, low wages, child labor, the exploitation of women in industry, slums, overcrowding, price-manipulation, cut-throat competition and the like. But are these the natural characteristics of the capitalistic system, or are they exotic growths which have accumulated on the system? We of the negative maintain that these evils bear the same relation to our social and economic system

that the fungus and vermin and dead limbs bear to the tree. And is it the general rule that when a tree has a few dead limbs on it, that it should be torn up root and branch? We think that you will agree with us when we maintain that the thing to do is not to cut the tree down and plant a new one in its place, but rather to do away with the exotic growth on the tree. In other words, we believe that merely because the oak has a few imperfections we should not condemn it, dig it up, and place another foreign, untested, unknown tree in its place. Yet that is just what the gentlemen of the affirmative advocate when they say that the present capitalistic system should be replaced by a scheme of socialistic control. The system of capitalism had its origin with the industrial revolution. Under it more progress toward human betterment has been made in a single century than in all the ages preceding its installation. Furthermore, bear this in mind — capitalism inherited some of the evils decried by the affirmative from its predecessor — feudalism. Can we expect it to remove all social and economic evils in the course of its comparatively short life thus far? Once more for this further reason, we contend that the affirmative indictment of the present system is unreasonable.

We believe that we of the negative are more reasonable and more just when we say that the present evils can be remedied without changing the essential nature of the system. Let me suggest a few definite methods. Take the problem of concentration of wealth. Without changing in any essential the nature of our present sys-

tem, without even approaching actual government ownership or control of the industries which produce this wealth, this problem could be met directly by increased income and inheritance taxes. If it is an injustice to permit a few sons and daughters of the idle rich to hold and inherit the various means of production and exchange for their own selfish benefit, then the state could levy, for the benefit of all the people, a considerable tax upon that wealth both at the time of receipt as profits or interest, and at the time of transfer due to death. In fact, this very thing is being done to-day. It is already a characteristic of the capitalistic system. If the concentration still continues in spite of our present levies, then the taxes could be considerably increased; but it would not be socialistic control, for the government would not assume the ownership and operation of the industries. Again, take those problems peculiar to labor — low wages, long hours, the exploitation of women and children. Laws can be, and are being, made to meet those evils directly under the present capitalistic system. There is hardly a manufacturing state that does not place some limitation upon the number of hours that men may work. The minimum wage is being considered by all our thoughtful legislators. Our states are interesting themselves more and more in the question of labor by women and children. And, where the state will not remedy these evils the national government is stepping in. Witness the Keating-Owen Bill, which is directly aimed at the suppression of child labor in factories. Yet all these reforms are being accomplished under the pres-

ent capitalistic system. In the actual conduct of business, too, the government, both state and national, is taking a hand. Witness the tremendous strides toward regulation which has characterized our legislation for the past two or three decades; and, with increased intelligence on the part of our law-makers relative to such matters, this movement will become more and more efficient. And bear in mind, ladies and gentlemen, that this is *not* socialistic control — far from it. The title to actual ownership and operation has not passed into the hands of the government and with the increased efficiency of supervision and regulation under the capitalistic system, the desirability of a complete socialistic control, such as our opponents support, will grow less and less.

Just a word in conclusion. When you hear the gentlemen of the affirmative making claims that many good things will be brought about under socialistic control, ask yourselves if these things are not actually being brought about under the present system. When they speak of evils done away with and reforms accomplished, ask yourselves if these evils are not now being eradicated and these reforms now being accomplished. When they paint to you the glories of socialistic control as contrasted with the black picture of capitalistic control, bear in mind that the latter is exaggerated and that the glories which they ascribe to the former are being attained under the system which we have at present. Of course, we do not say that the capitalistic system is perfect; but, as we pointed out, we cannot consider either system in its ideal aspect. And, as my colleagues will show you, socialistic

control, with human nature such as it is, would be far from perfect.

SECOND NEGATIVE, R. E. BAYES, YANKTON COLLEGE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: My opponent has dealt with stupendous sums. He has constructed an arithmetical Utopia that seems at first glance to be highly delectable. Throughout his speech there has been sounded a highly optimistic note, in sharp contrast to the pessimistic note that prevailed when the first speaker for the affirmative was telling you about the capitalistic system. The gentlemen of the affirmative fail to realize that their prophecy of a redeemed humanity under the socialist state is obstructed in its fulfillment by certain conditions and facts. If (and we would have you note that "if") all the good things spoken of by my opponent could be realized under socialistic control then we might be willing to grant that, judged externally, such a state of existence would be preferable to our present mundane sphere. But my colleague will point out to you that we have good reason to believe that the socialistic system will be less desirable than capitalism from the standpoint of actual business efficiency — the standpoint of the second speaker for the affirmative. And, furthermore, under all the roseate hues with which my opponent colored his remarks there is implied a certain fundamental change in our philosophy of life which we of the negative cannot acknowledge as granted in this discussion. In other words, it is my contention that a socialistic control of our economic

and political life is contrary to our inborn convictions regarding the proper relation between the state and the individual and that, even if it were possible to attain it in its perfect form (which, of course, we do not grant—as my colleague will point out), still it would be obnoxious to you and me as individuals, and it would not be preferable to the present social order.

In the first place, we believe we have reasonable assurance that under socialistic control individual achievement would be curtailed. This is something that has been given full play in the society organized under our present prevailing philosophy of the relation between the state and the individual. Under our traditional policy of *laissez faire*—just as little, not just as much, government as we can stand—full encouragement has been given to the largest possible development of individual gifts. Men of uncommon ability and endowments have sought to cultivate these attributes, and have placed their services at the disposal of the world because they knew that not only would their contribution prove publicly beneficial, but also that they would reap their own share of the harvest resulting from their genius. It is easy to understand why men should act thus. If a man of business genius can introduce some new device that will result in a large saving of labor, or in a considerable increase in the output of a certain article, it is the consensus of opinion to-day that that person is entitled to some tangible expression of appreciation from those who are to be benefitted by his invention or discovery. Under our present system this has been true, and con-

sequently men have ever been anxious to devise new methods of work, to invent new and improved machinery; and as a result much progress has been made in the art of manufacture. But would this be true under socialistic control? What inducement would be offered to invent a machine or a process that would displace government workers, who would be *ipso facto* the owners of all such inventions? Would they encourage genius to make machines that would deprive them of their employment? Or, granting that an invention would be made, what government official would ever try it, and thereby displace a thousand men whose votes he needed for re-election? Instead of the genius being encouraged to bless the world with the result of his thought, would he not be required to merge his individuality in the general mass of mankind, so as not to obtrude himself above the prosaic level of conventional mediocrity? Our opponents cannot deny that the whole philosophy of Socialism as a scheme for governmental control of the means of production and exchange is contrary to that philosophy which the Anglo-Saxon has always cherished. By its very nature it implies that the activities of the state are of infinitely greater moment than the self-development and self-government of the citizens who use the state as their mere tool. It would supplant the free activity of the individual, restrained by a minimum of law, by the despotism of a graduated and centralized officialdom, holding in its hand the resources of the community and having behind it whatever amount of force it finds requisite to carry out its decrees and maintain what it

deemed to be proper order. Herbert Spencer has well spoken of State Socialism, of which the governmental control of the economic side of our life is the cardinal feature, as "the coming slavery," for it would mean the "re-institution of status not under individual masters, but under the community as a master." Most of us agree with Senator Bourne, of Oregon, when he says: "The desideratum of all government should be the protection of its citizens and only such restraint of individual action as is absolutely necessary to insure the desired protection of all its citizens. As an incentive to individual enterprise and as a stimulant to individual initiative, the government should afford every citizen the largest opportunity for activity with hope of commensurate reward consistent with the rights of all. Public ownership (and, mind you, ladies and gentlemen, socialistic control of the means of production and exchange is the widest possible extension of public ownership), public ownership tends to destroy this initiative and to remove the hope of reward. Except in rare instances, it tends to discourage efficiency by removing competition."

Not only in theory, but in actual practice, socialistic control is undesirable from the standpoint of individual enterprise. The fears of those who oppose Socialism are fully justified by what we already know of government employment (a cardinal feature of socialistic control) as it exists to-day. Even the much-vaunted civil service fails to allay these fears. Its workings leave ~~much~~ room for criticism. You know, as well as I, of

many men under civil service to-day who are allowed to rot in minor "jobs" simply because they do not happen to be in accord with the party or men who are in power. Sometimes they even lose their positions entirely, no matter how efficiently they may be handling them. Look at the wholesale replacement of officials, high and low, in the Philippines when the Democratic party came into power. It may have been good "politics" to change these offices, there may have been even better reasons—but the fact remains that many competent men, doing meritorious work, were replaced by men less competent whose work since has been far from satisfactory. This is only indicative of the system that would generally prevail under socialistic control. Merit would not be valued. Conscientiousness and character would count for nothing. A dead level of uniformity would prevail among the skilled and unskilled, the industrious and the lazy, the man of fidelity and the careless man. And in this contention we believe our induction is fully justified. If these evils exist to-day under the very limited business activity of the government, and not even the most optimistic socialist can deny that, then it is surely reasonable to suppose that under socialistic control such evils would be co-extensive with the government's activities—in other words, would intrude into all departments of our business and industrial life. Would you prefer such a system to the present, under which, as a rule, merit receives fitting acknowledgment and due reward?

There is still another feature of socialistic control

which we know will not appeal to you. It would be obnoxious to you not only as a worker, but as a buyer. At the present time politeness and courtesy prevail in the business world because the exigencies of competition require it. Merchants show their patrons consideration because they know that only thus can their trade be held and the business successfully managed. If customers are not suited here, they will go there. Under socialistic control this salutary and wholesome state of affairs would be done away. There would be no need to be obliging, because if patrons were offended they could not obtain the goods elsewhere. Turn where you will, all is the state. Everybody would be at the mercy of the government employees. This arbitrary treatment of customers is a proverbial characteristic of monopoly—whether government or private. At the present time we have a socialized post office. Granted that in some cases the treatment received in the post offices is all that could be desired, it yet has to be admitted that in many offices the clerks are particularly unaccommodating and discourteous. Nevertheless, where such a condition exists all the people of the place must go to that office for mail and parcel post and money order facilities, because there is nowhere else to go. The same thing holds true in respect to railroads that are given a monopoly of the trade of any community. It likewise prevails, in even more exaggerated form, in our customs house officials. These men are a byword for bluntness and inconsiderateness; and what assurance have we that government officials would be otherwise under a socialistic state?

This careless and indifferent attitude is invariably developed under monopolies; and bear in mind, under socialistic control all instruments of production and exchange would be government monopolies. Once more, reasoning logically from the known to the unknown, we believe we are justified in maintaining that under the system advocated by our opponents these undesirable conditions would prevail throughout our country.

Under the shadow of a protecting, paternalistic government (which would be far from perfect, as my colleague will point out) all life would take on a dull, drab hue. If the socialistic control were the glorious success our opponents predict, then you would be continually fondled, coddled and pampered by an all-pervading system of state supervision over the details of your daily life. If, on the other hand, it turned out to be the political failure that we of the negative will point out it probably would be, then you would have to scrape and bow to the minions of an omnipresent state who would domineer over you. Would you prefer such a system to the present social order, in which you are merely asked to stand on your own feet and take your fair chance with your fellows? You know, as well as I, that the system advocated by our opponents, for these reasons would be exactly contrary to your very nature, because it would curtail your initiative and enterprise, because it would withhold from you the suitable rewards for meritorious work, and, finally, because you have an instinctive aversion for the domination of a paternalistic state. But, as my colleague pointed out, we cannot regard

human nature as changed to suit the convenience of the affirmative, and made to enjoy all these things, and, therefore, we brand socialistic control as not preferable to the present system from the standpoint of the individual.

THIRD NEGATIVE, L. H. JONES, YANKTON COLLEGE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The speaker who just left the floor made the statement that if a socialistic control would operate for the benefit of all the people under an autocratic government, then it ought all the more to operate for the benefit of the whole people under a democratic form of government. He said: "If the negative deny this, then they must show that the democratic form of government is not the best that has been devised to serve the whole people." In answer, we would remind the gentleman that we are here to-night discussing the merits of two economic systems and not two governmental systems, and we shall throughout this debate only consider governmental systems as they are especially fit or unfit to own and operate the economic system of an entire country. The gentleman himself has testified to the merits of an autocracy when it comes to efficiently owning and operating an economic system for military purposes. If such purposes happen to harmonize with what is for the good of all the German people, then certainly that example of autocratic government is not so bad. As regards the merits of a democracy trying to fill the shoes of a good business man, we shall hear more later.

Thus far in this debate the negative case has been confined to two propositions. You will remember the first of those to be that the affirmative indictment is overdrawn and that the evils which do exist can be remedied by specific measures without changing the essential nature of the present system. The second, that even if these conclusions are erroneous—which we have not granted and do not grant—still we find that a socialistic control would not be preferable to the present system, for it would be contrary to the best interests of the individual. Such has been the negative argument so far.

Bear with me now while we add a third reason why we believe that a socialistic control would not be preferable to the present system. It is simply this: socialistic control would be contrary to the best interests of the state as a whole, to the public at large. We shall point out that we have good reason to believe that it would be accompanied by certain evils—evils as great, in their own way, as any which may be ascribed to the capitalistic system. In other words, we shall continue our indictment of the very scheme which the gentlemen would have us accept on the basis of their indictment of the present order. They believe that because there happen to be evils in the present social order they have sufficient reason for advocating a scheme which turns the whole world upside down. Certainly, then, if it can be shown that there would be great evils in the socialistic scheme, that ought to constitute sufficient ground for believing, at least, that a socialistic control would not be preferable to the present system of private enterprise.

The first great evil which we have reason to believe would be found in a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange is what we may call, for want of a better name, unsatisfactory business methods. Right here, worthy opponents, listen to the story of a democracy doing business. We find that lax business methods characterize government enterprise wherever it prevails to-day. Furthermore, we find that the more democratic a government is the greater are the evils which fall under this classification. The more extensive the participation of the government has been, the more obnoxious these practices have become, and, as the participation in government through the extension of the franchise and the increase in elective offices has been widened, the greater seems to have been the tendency toward unbusinesslike methods. "Red tape," sometimes designated as "formal proceedings," has been synonymous with government business dealings. Mr. Robert P. Porter, Director of the Eleventh United States Census, says in his book "The Dangers of Municipal Ownership," speaking of that country which is the nearest approach to complete socialistic control of the means of production and exchange: "In Australia the government is in the hands of those whose interests as workers lie in the extravagant outlays on public works, whose knowledge of finance is limited, and who have little to fear in the event of a collapse—in short, the government may be described as expressing the collective wisdom of ignorance." But we do not need to look half round the world for conclusive evidence that govern-

mental business methods, especially under a democracy, are notoriously bad. We shall point them out to you in the United States, in the State of South Dakota, yes, and even nearer home — right here in the city of Yankton. It seems as if governments were inherently incapacitated for business. In the nature of business, with its accidents, its variations in volume and its position as connected with some sort of service, a very important element in the life of a concern is "responsiveness to the needs of the moment"; not unwieldiness and formality and committee-like movement. This is essential for several reasons: first, to insure against loss of life and property; second, to conserve credit, and this governments must always do; and, third, to guarantee adequate service always and increasingly better, as conditions demand it. Judging by present experiences, that element of responsiveness will be woefully lacking under socialistic control, due to the result of a natural law that permeates all branches of government endeavor and, like Banquo's ghost, "will not down." This law is the offspring of two forces; a fiscal theory, and a political practice. The fiscal theory is that not a stitch of government work can be done, not a dollar spent, unless there is some definite appropriation made therefor. So that if (as was the case with the government printing plant belonging to the postal service and located at Cincinnati) the appropriation should run out, and there was no money on hand with which to run the plant, the men would be compelled to quit work, although this would in no way hinder them from drawing pay at a later time for

the work they had not done. Yet the gentlemen boast of the post office as an example of socialistic control. But take an instance nearer home. Down here in Douglas Avenue, right here in our own city of Yankton, there stands an unfinished bridge—"monumental" of that fiscal barrier ever present between governmental plan and execution. When you inquire why it is left there unfinished, you are told the truth, which is, that this year it will be finished—the appropriation was used up at that stage last year, and work had to stop. That is a socialistic bridge. Is that the sort of inertia you would like to have in every business? Is it preferable to you to have that sort of uncertainty curtailing the efficiency of all methods of production and exchange? Yet the affirmative are upholding a system which would place all these instrumentalities under governmental control—and under just the same sort of government, as regards policies and men, as we have at present; for, as we pointed out, we cannot think of conditions made ideal to suit the affirmative case.

But besides this fiscal barrier, we said there was also a political practice which accounts in large measure for unsatisfactory business methods. Let us now see what that means? The political practice is—that no matter how much toil and money have been expended by experts in instructing legislators as to the needs of various departments, when the time comes for the vote, appropriations are not governed by the needs of the service but by the political demands of the moment. We can best illustrate ~~what~~ we mean if we refer to the actual situation here in

South Dakota. This state has put its educational, penal and charitable institutions in as many different counties as possible; and as a result, about three-fourths of the counties are tied hand and foot when it comes to voting on appropriation measures. Clay County, with the State University, has the votes of its four representatives pledged on a dozen or more measures. Yankton County with the State Hospital and also four votes, is likewise tied. Bon Homme's three representatives keep the Springfield Normal School in existence. Brookings can secure good appropriations for her Agricultural College with her six votes. And so it is with Hughes, Brown, Edmunds, Deuel and others, until out of a hundred and forty-nine good and true legislators at Pierre, eighty-five cannot call their souls their own when it comes to voting on appropriation measures. This means that generally an appropriation bill goes through, regardless of whether the author first consulted the state treasury and the needs of the various departments, or simply had in mind a good idea of politics and a vague idea of the "bottomless purse of the taxpayer." Is this actually what happens? Listen. Of the total number of bills presented at Pierre two years ago, only fourteen per cent. were appropriation bills. Yet, of the number that survived long enough to go to the Governor's desk, forty per cent. were appropriation bills. And it is a significant fact that the vote on these bills varied but slightly, indicating the existence of a "gentlemen's agreement," worthy of the most flagrant corporation abuse against which the affirmative rail.

It is exactly the same way at Washington — perhaps worse. Nelson W. Aldrich, one of the shrewdest business men that ever entered the Senate as a member, has said, in speaking of this very practice of voting appropriations: "The Federal Government wastes annually \$300,000,000. The application of common-sense business methods," he continues, "would save \$1,000,000 a day." On March 3, 1913, the Public Buildings bill was passed — in haste, so that President Taft could sign it before he left office. Of that bill, Senator Kern has said: "This measure is the boldest and most audacious raid on the public treasury that has been attempted in recent years."

Here are a few of the "satisfactory business methods" back of it all. New York City has no Federal Court House. The government rents space on the 27th floor of the Woolworth Building, and there the court is held nearly every day — and then the court is overworked. That bill refused to buy a site for a court house at New York, but in the same breath gave a \$110,000 marble building to the town of Texarkana, Texas, for a court house to be used three or four days in the year — and locked up the rest of the time. Chicago has postal receipts of \$23,000,000 a year and could not get the money with which to buy a site for a new post office that is sadly needed. But Vernal, Utah, which contains 836 people and has annual receipts of \$6,000 obtained an appropriation for a site and a building to cost nearly a hundred thousand dollars. That is the unscientific ~~financiering~~ financing that results from this obnoxious political

practice. Is it a desirable basis on which to rest the industrial welfare of America? Does it appeal to you as Americans as being preferable to the present way of financing the industries toward which we, most of us, look for our necessities in peace and our strength in war if it should come?

Why is it that such methods are prevalent? Listen again. Senator Hughes voted against a similar "pork barrel" bill, and said: "I know that I am valuable in the United States Senate. But I do not think that I am so much needed that Uncle Sam wants to pay \$50,000,000 to re-elect me." That is the secret of it all. Re-election — they know that will be more certain if money is put in circulation in their districts and it is re-election our legislators are after. Have we any right to suppose that things will change under a socialistic control? No. On the other hand, isn't it true that then the motive of re-election would be stronger, since then that senate office would be a man's only means of livelihood — everybody then will be working for the government, since the government will run all the industries and a seat in the Senate then will be about as choice a place as can be imagined. My opponent suggests that certain changes will take place under socialistic control. But, ladies and gentlemen, the American people seem to be pretty well satisfied with that sort of thing at present. And we have no right to suppose that under socialistic control they will take any more interest in the recall, when we consider that then they will be in danger of losing their chance to live if they "make a fuss," for they, too, will be government

employees and can be "released." Thus, we see that back of the unsatisfactory business methods in governmental enterprise are two fundamental things—an evil fiscal theory, and a bad political practice. Once more, we point out that we cannot think of human nature as changed to suit our friends of the affirmative, and we conclude that therefore this evil of unsatisfactory business methods will still obtain, and alone it is great enough to render a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange not preferable to the present system.

But this political practice assumes another aspect when we consider it in relation to socialistic control. We have held up to you the evils of graft and corruption in the present government system. This particular brand of evil to-day is inherent in the nature of our political system and has no relation to our economic system. But under socialistic control it is extended into the economic field as well and becomes immediately operative in the business conduct of some 288,000 corporations that to-day are privately owned and operated. If there is graft to-day, how much more opportunity for it with all these added fields? To-day we bargain and barter for post offices, court houses, asylums, penal institutions, forts, navy-yards, and the like. Under socialistic control we would have the same playing fast and loose with our mines, our factories, our railroads, our telegraphs, our telephones, our banks, our newspapers, our department stores and our bakeries. Would you prefer this to the present system? Do you not think that these evils would

be as great, if not greater, than any which have been ascribed by the affirmative to the present system?

NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, L. H. JONES, YANKTON COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We wish to remind you again that in this discussion we are defending the present capitalistic system, not for the sake of defending it alone, but in preference to anything so visionary and utopian as the plan which the gentlemen of the affirmative advocate. We realize that the present system has faults and evils; but we nevertheless feel that we are better off than we would be in a socialistic state. But we do not have to continue to live under the present system as it is. We have already shown you in answer to the first issue which the affirmative raised, that the present system can be remedied and the evils weeded out without changing the essential nature of the system.

In the first place, what is the impression of the whole affirmative case to-night? Overdrawn! Overdrawn as regards the indictment of the present capitalistic system and overdrawn as regards the promise of the socialistic control. Stop and think a moment, whether they have not painted a picture black as night. Why, one would think all investors reaped enormous profits at the expense of the workers and the people. Listen! For the past fourteen years the great Colorado Fuel and Iron Company has not paid one cent to the common stockholder. Now, if you feel so inclined you can make any legitimate business look hard and cold. They told you something about the Maxim Munitions Corporation! They missed

a good chance to tell you how the casket-maker, the monument erector and the undertaker speak of departed souls in terms of dollars and cents. Did they give credit anywhere for anything the great capitalistic system of individual enterprise has done for this country? No. Their indictment of the present system is overdrawn.

Their program for the future in a socialistic state is likewise overdrawn. In the first place, it is just a great, big promise!—A political platform—see the planks, Service, Collectivism, Co-operation! We haven't any assurance that it will work. Where you can point to one socialistic venture that has not been a failure you can find five that have been flat failures. In the first place, we say you have no assurance that the program of ideal Socialism will be carried out. Remember—they are holding up to you an ideal system that, in the complexion they are giving it, has never been tainted by human contact other than creation in a dreamer's brain.

Now let us consider the difference between their economic system and the one of to-day. There are three main differences: First, they claim profits disappear and service is to replace them. True, profits will disappear—if the politicians get hold of them. And, if they do not get them, we have all reason to believe that they will be unwisely spent, as are governmental revenues to-day. Service, if we can judge by any systems of government ownership to-day, will be poorer, not better. It takes twenty-four hours to telephone a hundred and fifty miles in France and the telephones are publicly owned. In Germany, many cities of more than 25,000 population

do not have telephone service after nine o'clock at night. Where can you find better service than we have in America in telephone, telegraph, rail or water — under private ownership and operation?

What was the second great difference? Individualism versus collectivism. And again, we admit that individualism will be done away with. Do you want it so? Is it preferable to you that it should be done away with? What will collectivism amount to in return? Let me refer you to the remarks that have been made in my direct argument as regards the efficiency of a democracy engaged in business enterprise. We have already seen that our government to-day is rotten to the core when it comes to the matter of spending money. Have we any reason to believe that it will be any different in the future? On the other hand, will it not be worse when more avenues of expenditure are opened up? Certainly the good results inherent in collectivism will be neutralized by the graft and inefficiency of a socialistic democracy. And the price you have to pay is to give up your individualism.

Lastly, what is the third great difference? Competition versus co-operation. And again, what does it mean if you do away with competition? It means that three hundred thousand traveling salesmen, another three hundred thousand engaged in the business of advertising, and thousands in similar pursuits, will have to seek new occupations. In the various other lines that make up the machinery of competition enough will be added to throw out of work nearly a million men and women. Now —

let the affirmative prove that their system will not make worse the condition of the nation as a whole, in the face of that fact! What is the co-operation given in return? First, co-operation between plants. And right here let us state that the sort of co-operation resulting will be negative, in that it arises not out of natural interest, but out of legislation. Secondly, it will be monopolistic in character. Do you want it? Would you prefer to market always with arbitrary agents of a government? And, lastly, the good effects of this co-operation would be nil, for the evils of a socialistic democracy would neutralize them. Remember, also, that nearly a million men will be hunting new jobs! What will the affirmative answer be? The characteristic Socialist answer: "We'll put them to useful work!" But remember they will draw salaries if they work, and what these salaries will take from the profits of a business is that much less to go for service or lower prices.

Thus, we see what their plan really amounts to. It promises a lot. No assurance that you get it. And even if you do, is it preferable to you? Listen! Unless you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the machinery of a Socialistic control is workable and dependable you are not convinced that a socialistic control would be preferable to the present capitalistic system. The one we have is only human, the men who live and work and exist under it are only human, and the men who will work in a socialistic state are human too, and no amount of legislation can grow them wings or change them at heart.

And now, in conclusion, briefly let me summarize what we of the negative have contended here to-night. We are considering whether or not a socialistic control would be preferable to the present capitalistic system. We of the negative say, No! For three reasons: First, the affirmative indictment is overdrawn and the evils of to-day, in so far as they do exist, can be remedied by specific measures yet leaving the nature of the system unchanged. Certainly, if we could rid our social order of these evils we would find the present system wholly desirable. But even if that were impossible, which we do not grant, still we maintain that the present system is preferable for: a socialistic control would be contrary to the best interests of the individual — contrary to your interests and to mine; contrary to our inborn conception of the relation of the state and the individual. And we say further, that if these propositions are not sufficient reason, we find another in the fact that socialistic control would be attended with as great evils as are in the present system, and that must be sufficient reason for it alone is the reason the affirmative put forward when they urge you to prefer a socialistic control. They tell us there are evils in the present system. In the light of all these considerations we ask you: Is a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange preferable to the present capitalistic system?

YANKTON COLLEGE BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BOOKS

- Abbott, Lyman, *The Spirit of Democracy*.
 Barnett, S. and H., *Practicable Socialism*.

- Benson, Allan L., *The Truth About Socialism*.
 Clark, Victor, *The Labour Movement in Australia*.
 Debs, Eugene V., *Life and Works*.
 DeLaveleye, *Socialism of To-Day*.
 Deming, Seymour, *The Pillar of Fire*.
 Ely, R. T., *Socialism and Social Reform*.
 Ely, R. T., *Monopolies and Trusts*.
Fabian Essays in Socialism.
 Flint, Robert, *Socialism*.
 George, Henry, *Progress and Poverty*.
 Ghent, W. J., *Mass and Class*.
 Hoan, Daniel W., *The Failure of Regulation*.
 Hillquit, Morris, *Socialism—Promise or Menace?* (Debate with J. A. Ryan.)
 Hillquit, Morris, *Socialism in Theory and Practice*.
 Howe, Frederick C., *Privilege and Democracy in America*.
 Howe, Frederick C., *Socialized Germany*.
 Jones, Benjamin, *Co-operative Production in England*.
 Kautsky, Karl, *The Social Revolution*.
 Kelly, Edmond, *Twentieth Century Socialism*.
 Kirkup, Thomas, *History of Socialism*.
 Key, Ellen, *The Younger Generation*.
 LeRossignol, *Orthodox Socialism*.
 LeRossignol, and Stewart, *State Socialism in New Zealand*.
 Lloyd, H. D., *Labor Co-partnership*.
 London, Jack, *People of the Abyss*.
 MacDonald, J. R., *Socialism and Society*.
 Mallock, W. H., *A Critical Examination of Socialism*.
 Marx, Karl, *Capital*.
 Marx, and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*.
 Mills, Walter T., *The Struggle for Existence*.
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*.
 Nearing, Scott, *Wages in America*.
 Peixotto, J., *French Revolution and Modern French Socialism*.
 Porter, Robert P., *Dangers of Municipal Ownership*.
 Rae, John, *Contemporary Socialism*.
 Ross, E. A., *Sin and Society*.
 Ryan, J. A., *A Living Wage*.

- Ryan, J. A., *Socialism — Promise or Menace?* (Debate with Hillquit.)
- Serrell, L. W., *Public Service Corporations*.
- Schaeffle, A., *Quintessence of Socialism*.
- Small, A., *Between Eras from Capitalism to Democracy*.
- Spargo, John, *Socialism*.
- Spargo and Arner, *Elements of Socialism*.
- Spencer, Herbert, *Social Statics*.
- Spencer, Herbert, *Study of Sociology*.
- Spencer, Herbert, *Man vs. The State*.
- Streightoff, F. H., *The Standard of Living Among the Industrial People of America*.
- Walling, William E., *Larger Aspects of Socialism*.
- Walling, William E., *Progressivism and After*.
- Walling, William E., *Socialism As It Is*.
- Wells, H. G., *First and Last Things*.
- Wells, H. G., *New Worlds for Old*.
- Wells, H. G., et al., *Socialism and The Great State*.

II. DOCUMENTS, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

- Statistical Abstract of the U. S., 1910 Census*.
- Report on Manufactures, U. S. Census Bureau, 1910 and 1913*.
- Report of the Comptroller of the Currency, 1913*.
- Pamphlets by W. F. Ries.
- Report of the National Civic Federation, Commission on Public Ownership, Part 1, Vols. 1 and 2*.
- Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, 1915*.
- Market Letters of Carl Pforzheimer & Co., and Charles A. Stoneham & Co.*
- The Intercollegiate Socialist*.
- The Appeal to Reason*.
- Lewis-Sylvan Debate on Government Ownership*, published by American Telephone and Teleg. Company.
- Briefs of Arguments on Public Ownership*, American Telephone & Telegraph Company.
- American Economic Association Bulletin*, 4th Ser. No. 1, Socialism — Discussion.
- Reports of Panama Canal Commissioners*.

III. MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

- Arena*, 40:432. *Socialist Ideals*, E. V. Debs.
- Annals of American Academy*. May, '15. *Socialism as Cure for Unemployment*. J. Spargo.
- Atlantic Monthly*. 107:24. Jan., '11. *Socialism and Human Achievement*. J. O. Fagan.
- Atlantic Monthly*. 107:580. May, '11. *Socialism and National Efficiency*. J. O. Fagan.
- Atlantic Monthly*. 105:836. *Socialism and Sacrifice*. Vida Scudder.
- Atlantic Monthly*. March '15. *Maxim Silencers for Old Wheezes*.
- Century*. 79:903. *Why Socialism is Impracticable*. C. R. Miller.
- Century*. 84:943. *Socialism and Its Menace; Why Government Ownership would not help the Wage-earner*. C. D. Hilles.
- Century*. April, '15. *Rise or Fall of Socialism*. F. R. Schoonmaker.
- Contemporary*. 93:658. *Necessary Basis of Society*. Sidney Webb.
- Everybody's*. March, '15. *War? Never Again: would Socialism do it?* Hillquit.
- Fortnightly*. March, '15. *Social Democracy and Peace*. H. M. Hyndman.
- Forum*. 41:129. *Objections to Socialism*. G. K. Chesterton.
- Forum*. 44:641. *New Socialism*. J. Boyle.
- Forum*. 54:407. *Herbert Spencer's "The Coming Slavery."* H. C. Lodge.
- Hearst's*. 23:985. *The Truth About Socialism*. A. L. Benson.
- Hibbert Journal*. 11:39. *Plea for Higher Socialism*. A. J. F. Blair.
- Independent*. 52:249. *Municipal Socialism in America*. J. C. Chase.
- Independent*. 55:1205. *Postal Service, A Phase of Socialism*. H. A. Castle.
- Independent*. 79:282. *Socialism: Promise or Menace*. Review of Ryan-Hillquit Debate. W. J. Ghent and T. N. Carver.
- Independent*. 75:265. *Trend Toward Socialism*. T. N. Carver.

- Living Age.* 262:707. *Century of Socialistic Experiments.* W. H. Mallock.
- Living Age.* 284:488. *Poor Man's Pig.* L. J. Jacks.
- Living Age.* Nov. 1, '13. *Blundering Social Reform.* G. L. Molesworth.
- Living Age.* 271:121. *Day After To-morrow.*
- Nation.* 56:102. *Socialism in Practice.* J. G. Brooks.
- Nation.* 89:560. *Socialism and Human Nature.*
- Nation.* 97:453. *Panama and Socialism.*
- Nation.* 97:357. *Socialism and Labor.*
- Nation.* 97:158. *Germany's Red Pope.*
- National.* July, '14. *Government Ownership of Telephones and Telegraphs.*
- New Republic.* 1:21. *Co-operation and Socialism.* J. G. Brooks.
- North American Review.* 144:12. *Fallacies and Dangers of Socialism.* C. Bradlaugh.
- North American Review.* 189:844. *Private Property and Personal Liberty in the Socialistic State.* J. Spargo.
- North American Review.* 196:305. *Socialism and the Farmer.* C. Johnston.
- North American Review.* 197:1-7, 181, 405, 556, 853. *What is Socialism?* A. M. Low.
- North American Review.* 197:588. *Socialism and the State.* J. A. Roche.
- North American Review.* 199:55-64. *Disappearing Right of Private Property.* D. F. Kellogg.
- Outlook.* 81:555. *Socialism in Practice.* R. Donald.
- Outlook.* 81:616. *Where Socialism was Tried.* W. D. P. Bliss.
- Outlook.* 84:10. *What is Socialism?* H. Whitaker.
- Outlook.* 88:537. *What is Socialism?* Lyman Abbott.
- Outlook.* 94:115. *Peaceful Revolution.* F. C. Howe.
- Outlook.* 95:876. *Industrial Democracy.* Lyman Abbott.
- Outlook.* 96:517. *Socialism — A Benevolent Despotism.*
- Outlook.* 96:374. *Socialism Again.*
- Outlook.* 97:732. *What Socialism Is.* E. H. Abbott.
- Outlook.* 102:15. *Capitalism, Progressivism, Socialism.*
- Outlook.* 107:608. *Socialism in Milwaukee.* A. J. Nock.
- Review of Reviews.* 31:622. *Socialism and Universal Peace.*

- Review of Reviews.* 43:725. *Socialism and National Inefficiency.*
Review of Reviews. 46:87. *Social Science and Socialism.*
Westminster Review. 167:521. *Socialism and the Law.* W. Hogg.
Westminster Review. 169:496. *Socialism in History.* F. H. Barrow.
Westminster Review. 180:117. *Fallacies of Socialism.* F. W. O. Ward.
World's Work. 12:7774. *Our First Experiment in Socialism.* F. T. Gates.
World's Work. 16:1051. *Our Government's Widespread Socialistic Activities.* J. Martin.
World's Work. 24:42. *World-wide Sweep of Socialism.* S. P. Orth.
World's Work. 26:315. *Germany — Model or Warning?* S. P. Orth.
World's Work. Feb. and March, '16. *America's Pork Barrel.*

INCREASE IN ARMY AND NAVY

INCREASE IN ARMY AND NAVY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LAW SCHOOL vs. COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, SEYMOUR SILVERSTONE, UNIVERSITY
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LAW SCHOOL, '17

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The most vital problem before the United States is National Defense. The reign of terror in Europe, complications of international diplomacy, violations of treaty agreements, and a disregard for the rights of non-belligerent humanity, have set this people thinking as they never thought before. It is exceedingly fitting, therefore, that the subject of the debate this evening should crystallize the idea which lies so close to the heart of America: "Resolved, that the United States should immediately and materially increase the army and navy."

When this question is stripped of extraneous matter, it means simply this: "Resolved, that the United States should increase its army and navy." We shall not indulge in any quibbling over the meaning of the words "immediately" and "materially." Any increase in the army and navy should be an immediate and material increase. We also notify the gentlemen that we do not

intend to make this debate a combat of statistics and authorities. The spirit of this question has grown upon us and we propose to argue it on the broad principle involved.

For one hundred and forty years we lived upon this continent in splendid isolation, serene in our confidence that no nation could oppress us, and complacent in our assurance that no nation would oppress us if it could. Our faith was founded upon three facts: First, the natural bulwark of 3,000 miles of ocean; second, the ideals and traditions of 2,000 years of civilization, solemnized and fortified by the pledged honor of the nations; and third, the sincere and loyal friendship of the entire world.

But over night, ladies and gentlemen, every fortress of our faith has fallen; 3,000 miles of sea have dwindled into an international rivulet; civilization reverted to barbarism; the pledge of honor became the tattered fabric of treachery; and friendship flamed into enmity. View this situation as you will, America stands at the parting of the ways. American ideals and traditions hang in the balance. America can no longer maintain her splendid isolation. The suffering of oppressed humanity, the prayers of the wounded and dying, and the cries of little children call her to new missions—to new endeavors. She cannot be true to herself, she cannot hold on high the principle of liberty, she cannot be America and refuse to answer. America has learned the lesson—"no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself." But, before we can perform this world mission, we must pro-

protect American life and liberty, we must maintain the rights of our citizens both at home and abroad, we must guarantee the national honor and integrity, we must prepare an adequate military and naval defense.

The sea no longer protects us. According to the War College, Japan can land 100,000 men on our coast in three weeks and in each succeeding period of six weeks can land 140,000 more. England and Germany, by using less than one-half of their marine, can in two weeks land hundreds of thousands on our Atlantic Coast. The ordinary ocean liner to-day carries over 6,000 men, while the *Olympic* and the *Vaterland* carry 15,000. The two greatest sea battles of this war were fought further away from their base than America is from Europe. Remember, ladies and gentlemen, that in the face of almost impregnable land fortresses, heavy guns, submarines and mines, the Allies landed a force of 250,000 men in the Dardanelles. Surely, in the light of these circumstances, the sea has ceased to protect us, and has become a military highway for our foes, upon which they are able to transport armies and engines of war faster than we can mass our inadequate militia, with all our combined railway facilities. The sea has changed from a barrier to a menace.

What, then, shall we say in behalf of the ideals and traditions of civilization? Of the obligations of honor? Civilization has substituted savagery for sanity. Belgium lies crushed beneath the heel of the conqueror; Luxemburg and Greece have become the pawns of battle; American women and children are slaughtered upon

the high seas; American property confiscated, and American commerce destroyed. Every law of humanity has been violated, and the bitterness and hatreds of a world war make it well nigh impossible to re-establish international law. Where is the Hague Tribunal? Where the celebrated peace treaties? Truly scraps of paper! Oh, the ruthlessness of this war! Surely, civilization no longer guarantees America protection.

But what of the third foundation of our faith? Can we not still rely upon the traditional friendship of the nations? Our submarine controversy with Germany, our blockade and contraband quarrel with England and France, our racial misunderstandings with Japan, our disputes with the fugitive *de facto* governments of Mexico, have destroyed the last of our supposed defenses. No academic dissertation concerning the rights of neutrals will wipe away the cruel fact that an American bullet killed father or son. True, if we had refused to engage in this commerce, we should have been misunderstood. But that is precisely our situation, whatever we do: Our purposes distorted, our charity and friendship misconstrued. We are hated and maligned for our very ideals and virtues. Our very neutrality has become our greatest source of danger.

With every ancient assurance of security destroyed, how shall we defend the national honor, maintain peace, and preserve inviolate the principles of American liberty, unless we materially and immediately increase our army and navy?

We do not propose a policy of Militarism. Militarism

does not consist in guns, in armies, in navies, in men, in engines of war. Militarism is the spirit and temper that exalt military aggrandizement. That spirit may exist, that spirit may dominate the people, whether the military establishment be great or small. No one who knows America can believe that she will ever permit the spirit of militarism to dominate her, no matter how great her defense may be.

Adequate military preparation is not inconsistent with the spirit of peace. The armies of Europe failed because they were the deliberately planned instruments of offense. They were created with the purpose and intent to satisfy the lusts and hatreds of years of strife. America is singularly free from all circumstances which tend to lead her into a war of aggression. But there is always the possibility that we shall be attacked, and our institutions are too sacred to jeopardize. Even though the probability of invasion be remote, yet, if war comes, our defenseless condition will be just as great as if that war were a certainty. The chances may be one in ten, or one in one million — when the catastrophe of war comes, it will be small consolation to reflect upon the ratio of probabilities. The advocates of a supine peace policy must absolutely guarantee that the United States will never be attacked by a foreign foe. The traditions and ideals which guarantee that America will never undertake a war of aggression will not protect her against a war of aggression, indeed, these very principles and ideals have led her very close to the verge of war during the present conflict.

And how weak we are to repel attack. The Bureau of Immigration reports that Japan can mobilize within ten days nearly 50,000 trained soldiers, who are at this moment residing in the State of California, and more than 100,000 trained soldiers, who are now actually upon the Pacific Coast. Our Pacific fleet is impotent and our coast defenses wholly insufficient. The Japanese already here could absolutely control the situation until reinforcements come from Japan, and within a few weeks could subjugate the entire Pacific Coast. Japan's declaration of war would be to blow up every mountain pass and the Panama Canal, and thus completely isolate this coast.

The gentlemen come from the Atlantic Coast—the center of the munitions factories—where most of our standing army is quartered, where almost all of our fleet is anchored. They do not, they cannot, realize how undefended our Pacific Coast is. Admiral Winslow says: "One good single enemy battleship could easily defeat the whole Pacific fleet." We need an immediate and material increase in the army and navy if it be only to protect the Pacific Coast.

But the United States has 21,000 miles of coast-line to defend, and a mobile army of only 30,000 men to defend it. Less than a single army corps now engaged in the European war, one-sixth of the standing army of Holland—less than three times the police force of New York City. At the outbreak of the present war the American navy ranked fourth among the navies of the world. No one knows where she stands to-day, for the

nations of Europe have been building their ships so rapidly that we have no knowledge of their present strength. Indubitably, England, which alone has launched sixteen new dreadnaughts this year, could bottle up our navy and transport an immense army to the Atlantic Coast. A combination of any two other powers would be just as fatal. Remember, ladies and gentlemen, the second navy in the world has been bottled up in its ports since the outbreak of this war, absolutely impotent.

We advocate an immediate and material increase in our standing army, as a nucleus for a constructive reserve; but we contemplate such an increase only as will meet the needs of the United States, when backed by a patriotic and well trained citizenship and by a mobilized and efficient economic and industrial system. Many plans have been proposed for the military defense of the United States, such as President Wilson's plan, the Swiss plan, the plan of the War College,—any one of these would materially increase the army. But the question this evening deals only with the advisability of making an increase. The best method of making this increase is an entirely different question, and the discussion this evening must be confined to determining whether or not an increase should be made. We believe the plan most consistent with the ideals and traditions of America is a national constructive reserve advocated by militarists and pacifists alike. A reserve that will put forth in time of peace, for constructive human advancement, the same extraordinary energy and invincible determination that it puts forth in defense of the nation in time of war.

We propose a merchant marine, an auxiliary fleet, an industrial and economic system of preparedness, military roads, armored automobiles, elimination of political patronage, and the organizing of our army and navy as a scientific institution. These make for effectiveness and, regardless of numbers increase the army and navy in fighting strength.

Because America must protect her integrity and honor and fulfill her heaven ordained mission to the nations of the world, be it resolved that the United States should immediately and materially increase its army and navy.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, MARK L. HERRON, UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LAW SCHOOL, '17

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentleman spent the greater portion of his time in attempting to prove that America is in no immediate danger of attack. He may be right in his contention. Our appeal for rational military preparedness is not made in view of new alarm. It is simply a plea for what we always should have done. Yet we cannot altogether ignore present conditions, for they draw our attention sharply to these long standing needs. We cannot ignore the fact that two-thirds of the mobile army of the continental United States is engaged in patrolling the Mexican border and in the attempt to capture Villa, that there are 60,000 trained Mexican veterans in arms this very moment, that the slightest misunderstanding may set the whole of Mexico ablaze against us, and that such an uprising must result in the massacre of Pershing's piti-

ably small force. We cannot ignore the fact that American citizenship is despised in Latin American countries, that Americans are forced to pose as foreign subjects in order to secure decent treatment. We cannot ignore the fact that Japan has again demanded the repeal of the anti-alien land law. We cannot ignore our neutral trade dispute with England, nor the perils arising from the war enflamed condition of the world, perils which the president of this nation deems to be so serious that he has stated that, "No man is competent to say whether we shall be drawn into the present European conflict or not." Mere words cannot argue away the statement of the President that, "The United States has reached the limit of its patience in the German submarine controversy. No longer can friendly relations be maintained merely by admitting the illegality of the act. Definite action will be taken." These conditions are not debatable. They are facts. Facts which are none the less facts because they are unpleasant, and because it is soothing to our national vanity to ignore them.

The entire argument of my opponent is based upon the premise that war is improbable. Let us see how he reached this conclusion. He considers world conditions and world motives. He attempts to analyse the Japanese situation, and the situation of Great Britain. He then tells us we need not fear war. Only omniscient knowledge is capable of the infallible judgment necessary to reach a valid conclusion in such a case as this. Dr. David Starr Jordan, who dedicated his whole life to the investigation, after he had considered the situation of

Europe from the standpoint of finances, of blood ties, of social relationships, drew as his conclusion the following proposition: "What shall we say of the great war in Europe, ever threatening, ever impending, and which never comes? We shall say that it will never come. The bankers will not find the money for such a fight, the industries of Europe will not maintain it, the statesmen cannot. Humanly speaking it is impossible." Yet a few weeks later the human fallacy of his teaching burst upon the world. Europe flamed into war. While Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of the university which the gentlemen so ably represent, was in Europe lecturing upon the Dawn of Peace and the Brotherhood of Man, the war broke, and he was unable to escape before a practical demonstration of the fallacy of his teaching was upon him. It is utterly futile for any man to say that war is certain not to come at any given time in the future. The mass of the elements he must consider, covering as they do the whole field of human thought and action, following the devious course of international friendship and race prejudice, delving into the intentions and ambitions of rulers and ruling classes, analysing the great unreasoning force of passion and misunderstanding, present problems which cannot be solved by the human mind. Inevitably certain elements will be minimized or left unconsidered, as the gentlemen from Columbia have left unconsidered the great basic causes of war.

The gentleman fails to realise that America is a world power. Her modern social and industrial needs require

commercial expansion. Yesterday we were the world's greatest producer of raw material, to-day we are rapidly becoming the foremost manufacturing nation of the world. No longer are we content to have our commerce carried in foreign bottoms, our whole nation is demanding the upbuilding of a merchant marine. Our manufacturing interests are in a mad fight for the markets of South America, Europe, Africa, and Asia. Annually through our consular service our government expends millions in the development of markets. Back of this is the demand of a united people, and the very urge of life itself. We cannot escape this expansion if we would, but it means increased contact with other peoples, and every new point of contact is a new point of strife, because competition is strife. One of the basic causes of the present war was the intense commercial rivalry between Germany and Great Britain, a rivalry which will inevitably be resumed at the end of the present war. Yet it is into the midst of this conflict of interests, into an atmosphere surcharged with hate and vaulting ambition, into the midst of a struggle for national existence, that America must go to satisfy the inexorable demands of her development. Will the gentlemen guarantee that the nations of Europe will quietly allow this commerce to slip from their grasp? The gentlemen blind themselves to the fact that our industrial development may be destroyed and our nation economically subjugated through the destruction of our foreign commerce that we can be made to suffer enormous damage, be deprived of our international prestige, and forced to accept terms

humiliating to this nation, without an enemy ever having set foot upon American soil. This is the first element of world conflict which the gentlemen have overlooked. Let us examine another.

Unless some revolution of human nature occurs, it is inevitable that this war will be followed by another and indeed by a series of world wars. The hatreds and animosities of this war have turned the whole of Europe into another Balkans. The least of the horrors of the present war are the horrors of its battlefields. Think of it, millions of Germans are praying "God punish England." Across the English Channel millions of Englishmen are hating with equal intensity. The hatreds of the Franco-Prussian War reach out across forty-six years of peace and to-day send millions of Frenchmen to their death. Will the gentlemen tell us when this hellish nightmare of murder will end? Can omnipotence itself wash out the blood and malice of the conflict? What treaty of peace can be other than the merest mockery? Whatever be the result of the war upon the European continent, the nation which controls the seas must win. The sea power of England will conquer in this war as it conquered even the genius of Napoleon despite the result of land battles. But Germany will not be crushed. No one who knows the genius and temper of the German people can believe that they will fail to challenge England's dominion of the seas. Germany will prepare to meet England on the seas, prepare to meet her ship for ship, and position for position, prepare to meet her for the recovery of her lost colonies and the commercial

supremacy of the world. Strategic positions in all parts of the world are potent factors in the control of the seas. Navies no longer blockade the ports of the enemy; modern blockades are blockades of entire seas. Our islands naked of effective defense become inconceivably valuable as naval bases, and will fall before the force of military necessity. The Panama Canal is one of the greatest strategic positions in the world. Its control is essential to the nation that would control the destinies of the Eastern Pacific. The Caribbean Sea is the door of the canal, and its islands the key. The loss of these positions will mean the loss of the canal, the loss of the control of the western sea-board from Cape Hatteras to Cape Horn, will separate the United States from South America and completely nullify the Monroe Doctrine, while the loss of Hawaii and the Philippines will mean the loss of the Pacific. These possessions of America control the destiny of the Monroe Doctrine, thwart Japan's desire for the control of the Pacific, menace England's communications with her Eastern possessions, and bar the great swelling tide of European and Oriental expansion from over one-half of the undeveloped land of the earth. Can we hope they will be safe unless adequately defended? The present war has demonstrated beyond all question that there is no sentiment in a life and death struggle between nations. The first declaration of the next war will be the seizure of strategical positions no matter by whom they are owned. Our rights and our possessions will be respected only in so far as we can support and protect them. This is the second danger to which our position

as a world power exposes us and there is yet a third.

The duties of a neutral require us to protect our possessions. If we fail to protect them, we become the ally of the invading belligerent, just as Belgium would have become the ally of Germany had she permitted the passage of German troops. Unless we prepare to protect our strategical positions we shall be thrust into a war against our will, a war in which we have no interest, and in the furtherance of which we shall have performed not a single affirmative act. Neutrality must be backed by force. The only guarantee of peace of Switzerland and Holland is vouchsafed them through their military force. America can only avoid participation in the next world conflict by means of an armed neutrality. The gentlemen overlook the fact that in a world war unarmed neutrality is an almost certain cause of attack.

The struggle for commerce, the possession of undefended strategical possessions and the preservation of neutrality, present the great causes of war, the fundamentals which the gentlemen have entirely failed to see. They are blind to the fact that nations, in their growth and development, converge upon a common objective, an objective necessary to the future growth and development of both of them. The objective may be commercial, political, geographical, or ethical, but whatever it is, once its acquisition is deemed necessary by more than one nation, they converge upon it, and when once the lines of convergence meet a desperate struggle ensues. Stripped of non-essentials, the condition of America is this, she must evolve like every other nation. She stands

upon the threshold of enormous expansion emerging from her ancient isolation into the arena of world conflict. Emerging into an arena crowded with hating, struggling nations, part of whom are armed with weapons of our making, inevitably our commerce, our political and social ideals, our very possessions, must converge upon the lines of development of other nations, and when they do conflict must result. Chief proof of this is the fact that wherever the lines of American interests have crossed the lines of interests of other powers we have conflict to-day.

These present the great dangers of war, dangers which we must immediately prepare to meet, though the war be years in coming. Islands cannot be fortified in a day, the upbuilding of an effective navy, the development of a well-trained army, and the evolution of plans of strategical procedure are the work of years. No man can tell when war will burst upon us. But when it comes it will be too late to prepare. Common sense and common prudence demand that we prepare and prepare now.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, CHANNING FOLLETTE, UNIVERSITY
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LAW SCHOOL, '17

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Let us first consider how far the argument has advanced toward a conclusion. The first speaker for the negative has undertaken to show that there is no immediate danger of invasion,—and he is right. It was not the fear of impending invasion that recently prompted the House of Representatives to vote a material and immediate in-

crease in the army and navy by a majority of 402 to 2,—it is not because we apprehend invasion that we are contending for such an increase,—but because it should have been provided long ago.

The second speaker for the negative has hit upon the underlying principle in this debate, that the United States must continue to defend itself by means of the army and navy. In order to preserve her territorial integrity, the lives and property of her people, her institutions, ideals, and above all her respected position in the councils of the world—America must still rely on Armies and Navies. That is to say, the negative have admitted, and argued, that whether or not there is an immediate danger of war, the dangers are such and the state of civilization is such, that America must continue to defend herself by an army and navy. So much for the danger of war, and that is sufficient for the purposes of this debate.

Next we are told that the goal of civilization is Universal Peace, and that America must lead in this movement. Truly did he speak, but even more truly, when he admits that America must first be able to defend her own integrity and honor in order to command the respect of the nations for those ideals of law and justice on which her position rests.

For two reasons, then, for self-preservation, and in order that she may fulfill her mission of world peace,—must America continue to maintain an army and navy.

The only issue, then, remaining in this debate is whether our army and navy are adequate for these purposes. In

other words, the remaining burden of the affirmative is to prove what every person in this audience already knows—that our present army and navy are in a state of deplorable inadequacy.

The vast territory of the United States, the wealthiest in the world, with 21,000 miles of coast line, is defended by a mobile regular army of 32,285 officers and men—slightly more than twice the police force of New York City—barely sufficient to man a single trench fourteen miles long.

Since the organization of the present regular army, new fortifications have been built at Corregidor, at Manila, Pearl Harbor, and on the Isthmus of Panama, necessitating a minimum increase of 50,000 men and 4,000 officers,—yet no such increase has been made or authorized; these fortifications are now manned by mere caretaker regiments, pending an adequate increase.

The 1915 report of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, shows that there is lacking fifty per cent. of the minimum peace quotas of the forts of the United States, or 25,000 men and 900 officers.

The Panama Canal, the most strategic point in our defense, is entirely undefended from land attack, its most vulnerable point. Secretary of War Baker, Colonel Goethals, and Brigadier General Edwards, commanding the canal garrison, all testified before the Senate committee that the minimum peace garrison for this land defense should be 25,000 men and 850 officers, and all of them urged more.

Former Secretary of War Garrison told the House

Committee on Military Affairs that there is an actual shortage of 1,800 officers below the minimum number absolutely necessary for the instruction, discipline and training of our present inadequate mobile army.

On March 14th, President Wilson stated with deliberation, "I haven't enough soldiers to patrol the border between this country and Mexico. I haven't enough soldiers for the regular duties of the army in time of peace."

General Funston, commanding the troops on the border, stated Tuesday: "The United States Army is grossly inadequate for the normal continuing purposes of its peace organization. There are not enough men in the entire mobile army to handle the situation in Mexico."

Ladies and gentlemen, and you gentlemen from Columbia, who believe in the necessity of the army, if this army should exist for any purpose whatsoever — it should at least be placed in a condition of minimum peace efficiency, to perform its ordinary peace functions — which contemplates an increase of at least 100,000 men and 6,550 officers or of over one hundred per cent.

But the coast defenses are manned and officered by the standing army and militia. In this branch it is impossible to rely upon volunteers in an emergency, at least three years being necessary to train a coast artilleryman; therefore, it is deemed necessary to keep the coast defenses fully manned at all times. Nevertheless, General Weaver, chief of coast artillery, in his report for 1915, shows that to-day the coast defenses are manned by but ~~one-third~~ of one relief; the prescribed minimum is two

reliefs. But in order to provide one full relief, an increase of 1,444 officers and 23,980 men is necessary. If they should be manned at all, it is utter folly to provide less.

The importance of aeroplanes to the efficiency of an army is recognized. France has 1,400, England 400, Belgium 400, Russia 800, and Germany 1,000, while the United States has, all told, but 23. No two are of the same type, none are armored, none capable of carrying guns, and all are antiquated. The war department investigating committee reports that in all twenty-four officers have qualified as fliers, fifteen of whom have been killed, twelve because they were required to attempt flights in antiquated biplanes known to be defective. Captain Bristol, head of the aeronautical division, stated to the Senate Committee that "for war purposes the aeronautical service is practically useless." Recent experience in Mexico bears him out. General Funston reports: "General Pershing started with eight aeroplanes; within two days all were disabled, unable to follow the column into Mexico."

The War Department asks, and the House of Representatives has authorized, the immediate construction of one hundred and eighty-six aeroplanes, fifteen dirigibles, and the addition of nine hundred and eighty officers, and two thousand five hundred men in the aeronautical service, or an immediate increase in this branch of over five hundred per cent.

The militia, the force, combined with the volunteers, upon which the ultimate defense of this nation rests, is

composed of a fighting force, eliminating the 10,000 non-combatants, of 117,000 men; of whom during the year 1915, 23,000 failed to attend annual inspections, 50,000 failed to attend camps of instruction, 65,000 never fired a rifle, and but 42,300 of those who did, qualified as second class men or better. Of the 2,000 organizations, 1,120 are below the prescribed minimum strength, that is, are short 85,000 men and 6,000 officers. In addition, the coast artillery branch, which is supposed to furnish one-half the coast artillery personnel, is short the prescribed minimum by 890 officers and 11,381 enlisted men. In order to increase the militia to its present authorized minimum strength, an increase of 102,801 officers and men, or ninety per cent. is immediately necessary.

True, honorable judges, we have not started to show the actual increase necessary to render our army an effective instrument of defense in all its branches, that we have not considered the needs of our foreign possessions, nor of training and equipping a volunteer force, nor of providing field artillery and ammunition,—but this much is certain, and it is sufficient for the purposes of this debate, that the army of the United States is in a condition of deplorable inadequacy, and that whatever purpose our opponents may assign for continuing that army in existence, in order to render it effective for that purpose, a material increase is immediately necessary.

But the needs of the navy are even more serious, because a navy requires years to build and years to train officers and men. The undisputed fact is that it takes ten years to train an officer, and four to train a seaman.

Yet a few days ago, Secretary Daniels told Congress that at this moment there are not enough men and officers in the entire navy to provide sixty per cent. of the minimum peace complements of the ships in commission; and he added: "It is a popular misapprehension that this shortage is due to difficulty in recruiting. On the contrary for three years the navy has been recruited to its full authorized strength day and night. The sole trouble lies in the fact that Congress has limited the number of men to 51,500, a figure far below the number actually required to man the ships in time of peace."

The figures of the Navy Department and the testimony before the House Naval Committee, a copy of which lies on the table, show that in order to provide the minimum peace complement of the fighting ships in the present navy, not contemplating the ships building and to be built, an increase of 18,983 men and 3,732 officers is immediately necessary. They show that in order to provide a minimum war complement, 105,000 men and 7,000 officers are immediately necessary, immediately necessary because they must be trained and ready at all times to take their places in the ships; and Assistant-Secretary of the Navy Roosevelt fixes the minimum number at 200,000. And further that a naval reserve of at least 50,000 men is indispensable to efficiency.

If we should maintain the navy at all, and our opponents say that we must, the least we can do is to provide the men necessary to man it, and this contemplates an immediate increase of at least 125,000 men and 9,000 officers. Surely a material one.

But even greater is the immediate need for submarines, scout cruisers, aeroplanes, torpedoes, mines, destroyers, mine-layers, auxiliaries, colliers, and ammunition. And why should I go into detail to prove the facts when the audience, the judges, our opponents, every peace society, every department of our government, including the Congress of the United States, recognize them to be true.

It is axiomatic,—if we should have an army and navy at all, they should be able to properly perform their functions. Much greater increases than we have contended for are undoubtedly necessary. But in order to place the army and navy which our opponents advocate in a state of minimum efficiency, a material increase is immediately necessary.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, SEYMOUR S. SILVERSTONE,
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LAW SCHOOL

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The argument on both sides to-night has reached a single issue. The gentlemen agree with us that we still need an army and a navy. If this be so ladies and gentlemen, why should not that army be placed on its minimum peace footing, and this necessitates a material increase in the army and the navy. Surely the gentlemen do not advocate the maintenance of an inadequate and ineffective army and navy. Such a program would be double folly; it would be expensive and would serve no purpose at all, ~~not even~~ the purposes required of it in times of peace, ~~let alone~~ in periods of danger.

The issue, then, is this: "Is our present army and navy adequate?" We of the affirmative do not anticipate war, we do not expect to see the United States embroiled with any foreign foe. It is true that the President has informed us that diplomatic relations with Germany will be severed if Germany insists on submarine warfare, and Germany refuses to concede her right to carry on this method of warfare. It is true that Pershing's little band is still in Mexico, a hostile country, and that any moment may see it cut off. It is true that America and England have become involved over mail seizures and merchant vessels; and it is also true that Japan has never forgiven America for the Alien Land Bill and our meddling with Japanese designs in China. These facts are not even debatable. But cogent as they are we do not base our case on them. We maintain that our present army and navy is not even sufficient in time of peace.

It is true that there is a difference of opinion as to the exact increase needed, but the latest opinion is unanimous that we need an immediate and material increase for peace purposes alone. Admiral Badger says 18,556 men and 933 line officers; Ex-President Taft, a noted pacifist, says 18,000 men and 1,000 officers; Admiral Dewey, 14,000 men; Secretary Daniels, 15,000 men; the investigating boards, 10,558 men in the Atlantic fleet alone, while Assistant Secretary of the Navy Roosevelt says 50,000 men and, in case of war, 200,000; Admiral Knight, president of the War College, says 25,000 in the navy alone; and Admiral Winslow said we need 10,000

men in the Pacific fleet. He said, "If you want me to say that we have no fleet there, I'll say it. We don't even pretend to have one there." Whatever figure is correct, the result is the same. We need a material increase in the navy for peace purposes immediately, for it requires four years to train a seaman and ten years to train an officer. You will find these statistics in the reports of the House Naval Committee, *Congressional Records*, Admirals' reports, and in the innumerable writings with which you are all familiar. Our navy is insufficient for peace, and therefore inadequate for war. Our fastest ship, the *Wyoming*, has 26,000 tons, and makes twenty-four knots. All four Japanese battle cruisers are heavier and from three to six knots faster. The *Queen Mary* class of English ships are twelve knots faster. The German ship *Bluecher* was sunk because she was five knots slower than any of the other ships engaged in the North Sea battle, yet, slow as she was, she had larger guns and was four knots faster than any ship in the American navy, built, building or authorized. (Page 582 of the "Navy Year Book"), which you gentlemen have just quoted. Admiral Fiske said: "It would take twenty years to prepare our navy to meet England, and five years to meet any other power." According to the annual report of the Secretary of the Navy, 1914, we are short ten battle ships from that contemplated in the 1903 program. Congress has supplied one-half of the vessels asked for by the general board. During the years 1904-1914 inclusive the board has asked for thirty-eight battleships; Congress gave them

eighteen. One hundred and eleven destroyers were asked for; two were given. Nineteen gunboats were asked; two were given. Eight scouts were asked; three were given. The board asked for two battle cruisers, three protected cruisers, twenty scout cruisers, fourteen torpedo boats, six ammunition ships, four motor torpedoes and received none. In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, let me remind you that so urgent did the Congress of the United States deem the need of an immediate and material increase in our army and navy that they passed a bill authorizing such an increase by a vote of 402 to 2 in the House. And we wish to leave this as a parting thought, if we need an army and a navy at all, in the name of consistency and common sense, why should not that army and navy be placed on its minimum peace standing?

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, MARK L. HERRON,
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
LAW SCHOOL

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The effort of our opponents to re-open general discussion is entirely beside the question. They have admitted that there is a possibility of war. They demand that our present army and navy be retained. They have narrowed this debate to the sole question, of whether this army and navy should be placed upon a footing of at least minimum peace efficiency. If we are to have an army and navy at all, why should it not be placed in a condition properly to perform its functions. If we are to have an

army at all, why should we have an army insufficient to patrol the Mexican border; an army insufficient for the ordinary duties of peace; an army short 154 officers and 7,533 men of its authorized peace strength; short twenty-eight and six-tenths per cent. of the officers deemed necessary for the instruction, training and discipline of the army? Why should we have an army, which, according to Secretary Garrison, requires 25,000 men in the regular army to put it on a peace basis?

If we are to have a militia, why should it be 105,000 men and officers short of its minimum peace strength?

If we are to have coast defenses, why should they be short 9,422 men for home defense, 3,666 men for our island and canal fortifications; why should the militia, which is supposed to furnish one-half of their complement, be short 290 officers and 11,381 enlisted men, a total deficiency of 856 officers and 24,489 men, or a deficiency of over fifty per cent.? If we are to have coast defenses, why should they be short seventy-three per cent. of the ammunition required for one hour's firing of the guns and fifty per cent. for the mortars? If we are to have coast defenses at all, why should they be rendered useless by absence of land forces necessary to repel land attack? According to the War College, 21,670 men are necessary to defend the Panama Canal, and 25,000 necessary to repel land attack; we have but 1,681; 25,000 are necessary to defend Hawaii; we have 6,831; 1,915 are necessary to defend Alaska; we have but 431.

The War College proposes the above figures for peace

purposes alone, and all authorities agree that they must be increased in case of war.

If we are to have field artillery, why should it be short 5,160 men and 380 officers of minimum efficiency? Why should it be short 1,982 field and artillery guns, or short over 400 of its minimum strength? Why should our largest guns be but six-inch, as opposed to the twelve and one-half-inch howitzers and mortars of other nations? Why should our machine guns be of obsolete pattern? Such guns as jammed at Columbus, New Mexico? Why should we be short 405,000 rounds of artillery ammunition, and short 11,200,700 rounds of rifle ammunition?

If we are to have mines at all, why should we have but one-fortieth of the mines necessary to fortify even our harbors, and but one mine layer in the entire navy?

If we are to have submarines at all, why out of 59 should we have not a single ocean-going vessel? Why should eleven not be fit for submerged work? And ten unsafe because of defective batteries?

Since every military and naval expert admits that we must have a reserve of at least 500,000 men in time of peace, why should we have a reserve of but 16 men?

If we are to have a militia, why should it be 105,000 men and officers short of its minimum peace strength? Why no animals for the signal and sanitary troops; why short 1,934 wagons?

The gentlemen have answered because "Pork at any Price" exists in this nation. Yes, "Pork" does exist, but there are still things in this nation worth saving.

Since it exists the gentlemen can do no less than demand that it be immediately eradicated. This we have demanded. And further demand that, with its eradication, the army and the navy be immediately placed at least upon a basis of minimum peace efficiency.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, CHANNING FOLLETTE,
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LAW SCHOOL

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The President of the United States, its State Department, its Congress, all see in the world situation of to-day dangers that call for immediate action toward greater preparedness. And our opponents admit the existence of these dangers when they assure us that no one believes in the necessity of preparedness more than they. Still, they analyze the world situation, and from their analysis, reach the opposite conclusion.

Their chief argument is that the exhaustion of Europe renders a war, except in the distant future, impossible. But let us remind the gentlemen from Columbia that those nations that are to-day murdering American citizens on the high seas, bottling up American commerce, breaking every law of nations and humanity, besmirching American honor,—that are to-day desperately bankrupt through their indebtedness to the United States, that these countries are to-day mightier in war, than ever before in the history of the world. Their whole economic and social system is directed toward military efficiency,—their weakest armies are to-day mightier than America's mightiest,—their navies remain practically

untouched and tremendously increased since the outbreak of the war. That instead of being exhausted Europe will emerge from this war mightier than ever before in its history, as America was mightier immediately after the Civil War than ever before in its history. America stands in greater danger of a European conflict following the present war than ever before. Our statesmen and our government are right, and our opponents are wrong, and in this respect the negative's case falls down.

Let us analyze. The negative admit the danger of war and the necessity of maintaining an army and navy. They have been zealous in deploring the inadequacy and inefficiency of the present army and navy. But they hope to win this debate by hinging their case upon the word, "immediately," urging the crying need for the increase and reform of our army and navy, but oppose doing it now.

And why? First, because there is no immediate danger of war. We have pointed out that the present world complications do present immediately menacing dangers calling for immediate action.

But whether or not there is immediate danger of invasion, are we to wait until an invasion is actually pending before we begin to build ships that take three years to build, to train officers that take ten years to train, to train coast artillerymen and sailors that take four years to train, to build guns, submarines, ammunition, roads, and fortifications that take years to build? No, if an army and navy should be maintained at all, these things must be done immediately; they must be put in a state

of at least minimum efficiency immediately if they are to be effective instruments of defense in time of actual invasion.

Finally, our opponents retreat to the last trench, and tell us that there is deplorable corruption and inefficiency in the army and navy that must be eradicated before any increase is made. Aside from the fact that we have cited but the lone instance of the aviation service to prove this contention, let us, for the sake of argument, reiterate your statements, for to a certain extent they are true, there is inefficiency and inadequacy; we know that this is so; Congress has found it to be so. But what is the answer? Our opponents tell us to wait; do not act immediately. Why not immediately? Do not such conditions call for immediate action; shall we not eradicate them at once? And the very methods by which Congress hopes to accomplish this reform, the adoption of a budget system and the creation of a general staff for the navy, will only be accomplished by putting them in operation, which means not only a more efficient, but a materially increased army and navy. Reform and increase are not antagonistic ideas, but one can and will be accomplished only by accomplishing the other.

The cry of the negative to *delay*, in the midst of these conditions which they have to admit exist, must be answered in the negative. When Congress by an almost unanimous vote authorized an immediate increase, they answered it in the negative. With but one exception, every American statesman has answered it in the negative, as has the overwhelming sentiment of the American

People and the American Press. And we urge upon you this evening the immediate necessity of a material increase in the army and navy.

FIRST NEGATIVE, JAMES W. DANAHY, '17 COLUMBIA
UNIVERSITY

Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: It has been well said that the problem we are discussing this evening is one about which people cease to think as soon as they begin to speak. To-day we are told that we should build eight first-class battleships; to-morrow we are informed that dreadnaughts have outlived their usefulness, and that our defense must be based on submarines. In no particular do the experts agree as to the actual needs of the country. Therefore, in this matter we must use caution and not adopt a policy which will lead us into the European conflict; instead we must adopt a policy which will offer us the required protection and at the same time keep the country out of the armament competition.

It is the desire of the negative this evening to remind you of several points which the affirmative in their generalizations of the danger in which the country lies have overlooked. We believe that of all times, the present is the least suited for generalizations, for hasty, irrational action, or for an impetuous step which might plunge the country into a period of big armaments which would result in needless and ever-increasing expenditures.

First, we of the negative wish to point out that there is no danger of an immediate attack upon this country and that the likelihood of a future attack is not great

enough to warrant an immediate increase when one considers the disadvantages which such an increase would bring. Secondly, with the single exception of the army, we believe that our present armament is competent to protect us from all likely dangers. Lastly, with regard to the army we shall show that an immediate increase, such as is advocated by the affirmative, would not only be undesirable, but actually would diminish our preparedness.

The contention of the negative this evening is — that we must not adopt a hasty, ill-considered policy; we must guard against being swept into one extreme or the other: we must look at this question coolly, reasonably, thoroughly,— and then decide what our policy shall be.

Now, then, what is the need of an immediate increase in our forces? It must be for one of two reasons: either the affirmative fear an immediate attack, or they believe in a future attack and think we should begin to prepare immediately for such a calamity. Let us first consider whether we are likely to be attacked immediately. The countries which are most likely to attack us are: Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria, and Japan. In other words, the Allies and the Central Powers.

Certainly the affirmative cannot fear the Allies. Not only have the latter their hands full at the present time with Germany, but they are and have been friendly with the United States. Likewise, the Allies are depending on this country for their food, their ammunition, their clothing, and their artillery. By attacking the United States, they would be cutting off their own source of supplies.

Finally, an attack on this country at present would take away a large part of the fleet of the Allies and would make a German victory certain. When we consider all of these facts, we can be sure that the Allies will not attack this country overnight.

Consider the Central Powers. The German fleet is bottled up securely in the Kiel Canal and the British fleet is acting as the cork to the bottle. Needless to say the German fleet is not likely to get out from the canal very soon. But even if it could, Germany has still to whip 150,000,000 Russians, 53,000,000 Japanese, 45,000,000 English, 40,000,000 French; she must defeat untold millions in the smaller states of Europe, in Portugal, Belgium, Serbia, Montenegro, etc.; she must defeat the Canadians, the New Zealanders, the East Indians, the South Africans, and others too numerous to relate. By the time that Germany and Austria have done all of this the likelihood of an immediate attack will not be great. With the German fleet engaged and with the Austrian fleet a negligible quantity, where would the Central Powers raise the men, the money, and the ships to cross the ocean, even if the British fleet were not present to block the way?

And now how about Japan? At the present time, ladies and gentlemen, the people of Japan in some instances are paying taxes averaging as high as thirty per cent. of their incomes for the past wars in which Japan has engaged. Japan, looked at from all points of view, is not in a position to wage a war against the United States. Furthermore, Japan has a treaty with this country which lasts until 1921 and by terms of which all undesirable

aliens are excluded from the United States. And do the gentlemen of the affirmative realize that in her trade with all countries Japan has a favorable balance,—that is, she exports more than she imports,—with the United States alone. She would be sacrificing all of this advantage should she break off friendly relations with this country. With regard to the weaknesses inherent in the Japanese army and navy, and the military impossibility of a Japanese attack on the United States or its possessions, my colleague will go into details to explain. When we consider, in addition to the facts mentioned, that Japan is compelled to use part of its fleet to protect the islands captured from Germany, we can say without fear of contradiction that this country is not likely to be attacked immediately by Japan.

All of these facts lead but to one conclusion:—since there is no danger of an immediate attack we have sufficient time to do the very thing first mentioned by the negative:—that is, to give this question further consideration, and then to adopt any additional means of safety which we soberly decide are necessary for the proper defense of the country.

And now we arrive at the question of the likelihood of a future attack and the necessity of preparing immediately for that event. What is there which will make a war between this nation and a foreign power likely? Can the gentlemen of the affirmative for an instant contemplate the exhaustion which the countries of Europe will suffer at the close of the present war, and still contend that we are likely to be attacked? Do they realize that in the

first year of the war alone the cost in lives was nearly five million, while the loss in wealth was \$30,000,000,000? All of the wars of the world added together from 1790 to 1910 cost only five million lives and some \$25,000,000,000. Do they realize that the countries have been drained and devastated; that industry has been stopped; that crops have been ruined; that all Europe is waiting for the moment when peace shall be declared in order that it may begin to restore the wealth which has been destroyed;—do the affirmative for an instant believe that the men, the women,—those who carry on the war and who make it possible—could be forced into another war even if the rulers so desired?

No, our friends of the affirmative have overlooked these salient facts and have fastened upon some of our policies as possible excuses for a conflict. Let us consider these policies. First of all, the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine, ladies and gentlemen, is not a new doctrine. It has been in existence for nearly one hundred years, and never yet has this country had to defend it by the use of force. The Monroe Doctrine is a policy which demands mainly naval strength to uphold it, and Great Britain, the strongest naval power in the world, has officially accepted the doctrine. Furthermore, we are not defending the Monroe Doctrine alone, as we have the combined force of Pan-America to back us up in our demand that no country endeavor to gain additional territory in the Western Hemisphere, and we can rest assured that no European nation will tacitly agree to another nation appropriating land on this continent.

We may be told that the Panama Canal needs great protection. To this we can only respond that the Panama Canal is guarded as well as human ingenuity can provide; that Colonel Goethals has said it is well-fortified; that it is mined at both ends; that the strongest coast defense guns in the world are placed at either exit; and finally that Europe as well as the United States is anxious that the Canal should be kept open.

Let us consider the maintenance of the integrity of China. Again, as in the case of the Monroe Doctrine, we do not have to support this policy alone. Six nations are concerned in keeping an open door in this country. Should some one step in and endeavor to close that door, the rest will see that the doctrine is upheld. You are thinking, possibly, that the rest of the nations paid little attention to the recent steps taken by Japan. But remember that these nations are at war; remember also that while this country was engaged in the Civil War it suffered Maximilian and the French to enter Mexico, but as soon as the war was over we reasserted our policy. When the present war is over Europe can be depended upon to see that the Open Door is maintained.

Considering the condition of Europe at the present time and the exhausted condition in which it will be at the close of the war, and then taking into account the pseudo reasons which are advanced by persons to show that a conflict is likely, we have ample grounds for believing that there is no likelihood of a conflict in the immediate future between this nation and any foreign power; hence there

is no reason why we should increase our army and navy immediately and materially.

At the close of the war, ladies and gentlemen, we shall witness a change in the policy of the nations. Either they will agree to a joint limitation of armaments or there will be a competition of armaments even greater than the one which we witnessed up to 1914. In either case a material increase in our armament at the present time would be unwise. If the world is to agree to a limitation of armaments it would be a needless expense. If, on the other hand, we again try to maintain peace by armament, the armament which we adopt at present would be out-of-date. This is the greatest opportunity of all time in which to adopt a definite national and international policy of preparedness.

Again the negative asks for a sober consideration of this subject. If there is no danger of an immediate attack, then there is no reason for an immediate and material increase: if there is no likelihood of a future attack, then there is no reason why we should begin immediately to prepare for such a contingency. On the other hand, there is every reason why we should not increase at present.

Finally, the negative desires to ask the gentlemen of the affirmative two questions. In the first place, will they point out just why there should be an immediate increase in our forces, and in the second place, do the affirmative expect an attack from Great Britain?

THIRD NEGATIVE, EDWARD M. EARLE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: So far in the course of this debate the negative has pointed out first, that there is no reason for increasing our military forces because of any immediate danger and that an immediate increase for any probable future danger is impractical; second, that a material increase in our navy and coast defences is unnecessary, as these branches of the service are adequate for all of our needs. We come now to a consideration of the Army of the United States.

It was a wise Secretary of War who said that the trouble with the Army is that its survey boards do not survey, its courts-martial do not court-martial, its promotion boards do not promote, and its retirement boards do not retire. This is a serious indictment, but it is well-founded. The United States Army is unsoldierly, disorganized, inefficient, and wasteful.

American democracy is non-existent in the Army. There is no such thing as promotion on the basis of merit, and as a result we have slovenly officers using slovenly methods. Huge maps of the seats of the European War placed on the walls of the officers' mess at West Point recently were taken down because our officers and the instructors of our future officers were so little interested in the lessons of the Great War that it was not worth while to retain them. With facts like this in mind it is not difficult to discover what was the trouble with the punitive expedition into Mexico. Eight thousand of our troops, concentrated on the border for about twenty

months, and expecting at any time the order to cross the Rio Grande, were not ready when the crisis arrived. They were delayed for a week in the hustle and bustle of mobilizing a few motor trucks to transport the necessary supplies. This is the foresight of the American army officer!

You will recall that during the Spanish-American War our real enemies were not the Spaniards, but the sanitary corps of our own Army. The graves of thousands of victims of disease in our camps are lasting monuments to the shame of medical inefficiency. But we have not yet learned the lessons of 1898. At the citizens' training camp held at Plattsburgh, N. Y., last summer a regiment of 1,000 men was bathing in the water supply of the city for two days before the sanitary experts discovered the fact.

The atmosphere of inefficiency and indifference extends to the men. The finest natural soldiers in the world are being spoiled by lack of discipline and training. In the recent Mexican raid on Columbus, New Mexico, a machine gun company turned its weapons on the bandits only to find that the guns became clogged, not because there was anything the matter with the guns but because the men did not know how to operate them.

Then, too, the army is the victim of "honest graft." Three years ago Congress legislated into existence an aviation corps and provided thirty-five per cent. extra pay for the dangers incurred by those serving in it. At a recent trial of a lieutenant-colonel in the Army, Captain Cowan of the aviation corps testified that he and certain

of his fellow officers had been drawing \$113.00 a month extra pay for twenty-five months, although they never had been in an aeroplane.

We offer these facts not as an utter condemnation of the officers and men in the Army of the United States but as proof that there is something radically wrong with our present military system,—something which can only be aggravated, not remedied, by an increase. Bad soldiers do not become good ones merely because we authorize more of them. Slovenly officers are not made soldierly because they are promoted and their importance otherwise is increased. One thousand machine guns out of action are less to be desired than ten. A sanitary corps does not become sanitary by virtue of the fact that we increase from 100,000 to 1,000,000 the number of men under its care. More aeroplanes and more Captain Cowans can assure aviation only on the part of the budget.

The experience of Russia has for us tremendous significance if we will but see the handwriting on the wall. Russia expended hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars on her army. She had between six and ten millions of the finest soldier material in Europe. And yet Russia was beaten,—beaten because her military system was on a foundation of sand, because she believed that preparedness was a matter of increasing appropriations and increasing numbers, rather than of increasing efficiency. And we are asked to follow in the footsteps of Russia. We do not desire the Prussian spirit in the Army of the United States, but we do demand German efficiency and German thoroughness. If we fail in this, we are fail-

ing in the very fundamentals of national defence. A government is a murderer which sends to the front well-trained men whose lines of communication are a trail of inefficiency, of short-sightedness, and of "honest graft."

If we Americans have anything to fear, it is not the fate of Belgium or of Servia, but the fate of Russia. No one can seriously think for a minute that it is physically or politically possible to exterminate a nation of 100,000,000 people with the potential strength of this country. But it is possible to sacrifice the flower of young American manhood to failure in our greatest opportunity of all time to effect a thorough-going national house-cleaning,—the military, political, economic, and social advantages of which cannot be overestimated.

When we have reorganized our military resources,—when we have rooted out the inefficiency, the slovenly methods, the pork-at-any-price, the political influence,—it may or it may not be necessary to increase the size of the Army. But what the gentlemen are defending this evening is an immediate increase in face of the fact that such an increase must have all of the weaknesses of the present system, unless we direct our primary,—i. e., our immediate,—effort to reorganization and our secondary,—i. e., our future,—effort to such an increase as the future may prove necessary.

Not only is an immediate investigation and reorganization of the Army necessary, but an immediate increase without such a previous investigation and reorganization is the worst possible thing we could do for the Army at the present time. Upon an unsatisfactory and

obsolete military foundation we would be building an enormously costly superstructure which would be worth less because of the weaknesses of the foundation. We would acquire only additional clumsiness, inefficiency, and disorganization. We actually would be decreasing, not increasing, our military effectiveness.

To conclude, we of the negative have shown: (1) That there is no danger of an immediate attack on this country and that any immediate increase in the army and navy for a future attack is impractical. The nations of Europe at the present time are engaged in a death struggle, the effects of which they cannot hope to overcome for generations. In the midst of the chaos of the Great War we, the American people, are called upon to face the greatest crisis in our history as a nation; and although we never were in less danger of foreign aggression, there never was a time when we more needed national common sense and foresight. Second, we have proved that an immediate and material increase in the navy and coast defences is unnecessary, as these branches of our defence are adequate for all of our needs. We have pointed out in this connection that the United States not only is not defenceless, but that it possesses at this very moment a navy which ranks third in both tonnage and big guns and which in efficiency is surpassed by no fleet afloat; furthermore, that our coast defences are, in the opinion of military experts, the finest fortifications of their kind in the world. Finally, we have proved that the trouble with the army is not primarily that it is small, but that it is poorly organized, that it is inefficient, that it is the victim

of "honest graft." To increase this army immediately is only to multiply the evils of the present system, to give us a clumsy, inadequate, and inefficient military establishment. Unless we devote our immediate effort to reorganization and our future effort to increase should it be necessary, we in reality are decreasing the effective strength of the United States Army.

But there are involved in this question greater issues. If the gentlemen of the affirmative would have us adopt the European policy of armament and super-armament, they must explain beyond any question of a doubt why the results will be different. In any event the proposed material increase would be so far-reaching in its effects that the gentlemen must present overwhelming evidence in its favor. We are going before the world as supporters of the very system which we are told this war is being fought to prevent, and the world is taking cognizance of our stand. In the words of Lord Rosebery, the famous English statesman, "I know of nothing more disheartening than the announcement recently made that the United States,—the one great country left in the world free from the hideous, bloody burden of war—is about to embark upon the building of a huge armada." This is the appeal of blood-soaked Europe to America. What shall be our answer?

•

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS

•

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS

SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE vs. UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS

On the evening of March 30, 1916, a team of two men from the University of Redlands, Redlands, California, met the Southwestern College affirmative at Winfield, Kansas, on the proposition of federal ownership of the interstate railroads. The Southwestern men won unanimously. The Redlands team had met the University of New Mexico affirmative on the same question on the evening of the 27th, while on their way to Kansas. They used the same speeches in both debates, winning from New Mexico unanimously.

The speeches in this debate are published because of the strategy and tactics involved. The negative interpretation is not the usual one given this question, and is calculated to win because of its surprise effect and because there is practically no argument or assertion that can be questioned except the point of view taken or rather the interpretation of the question itself which the negative chooses. Southwestern won because its debaters recognized this fact, recovered quickly from their surprise, and admitted frankly that they had no case if this interpretation were accepted. They were skilful enough to win the sympathy of the judges. At New Mexico the surprise was completely successful. The question was stated, Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all interstate railroads.

The Southwestern speeches were contributed by Prof. A. J. McCulloch, Department of Economics, in charge of debate at that institution, and the Redlands speeches by the two debaters, Mr. Fagg and Mr. Jacobsen.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS

*SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE vs. UNIVERSITY
OF REDLANDS*

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, THOMAS A. WILLIAMS, SOUTHWESTERN
COLLEGE, '16

Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: Should the federal government own and operate all the interstate railroads? In presenting the affirmative of this discussion, Honorable Judges, it is our duty to designate the issues and limits of this question. It is also our duty to assume the burden of proof, which we willingly do. Since our position demands that we be constructive, that of the negative likewise demands that they be destructive and meet our arguments with an adequate defense of the present system. For the opposition to seek in any way to modify the present railroad situation by any compromise measure or suggestion of reform, is to admit our contention that the present methods have failed, and also to place upon their shoulders an equal share of the burden of proof.

Honorable Judges, the affirmative admit that the railways of the United States as they stand to-day are the greatest evidence of constructive work in the world. We

also admit that government ownership will not be a panacea for all evils. It will not change human nature. We also admit that government ownership of our railroads would have been inexpedient in the past. But, Gentlemen of the decision, we are facing a new situation. A new industrial era is stretching out before us. The railroads of this country are facing a crisis to-day. The question at issue is, will they be able to meet this crisis successfully and adequately and acceptably meet the demands of the present and future, or will the government, in the interests of the general public, be compelled to take them over and operate them?

Honorable Judges, it is the contention of the affirmative that the federal government should own and operate the interstate railroads, and we base our contention solely upon the basis of expediency. Railroad men to-day unite in saying that they can go no farther. They say that the railroads at present cannot handle a reasonable degree of prosperity. They also say that to finance the future is a hopeless matter. It may be that our worthy opponents can point the way out of the present dilemma, but if they can, Honorable Judges, they possess more financial acumen than such men as Ripley, Hill, McPherson, Mudge, and Hine. In view of this hopeless situation, Honorable Judges, we urge government ownership of our interstate railroads, not as a socialistic measure, or as the radical scheme of a wild-eyed reformer, but as the only expedient alternative that can be taken.

Expediency, Honorable Judges, was the prime motive that actuated all the foreign nations possessing govern-

ment-owned roads to take such a step. The Belgians and Swiss adopted the policy to prevent the domination of foreign capital; Australia, because this was the only way to obtain capital; Italy, to end the complications between the railways and the states; Germany, to unify the states and to give military efficiency.

Confronted by these different crises, each nation chose government ownership as the most expedient solution of its difficulties and only a prejudiced mind would dare say that these nations acted wrongly. When we stop to consider that fifty of the fifty-four leading nations of the world have government ownership, not in theory but in actual practice, and "not a single one of those countries has found public ownership and operation a failure, but a great success," we must consider the validity of this course in the light of precedent and the demands of expediency.

Honorable Judges, the federal government should own the interstate railroads, because,

I. The present policy of private ownership and government regulation has failed.

If all our railroads manifested that degree of efficiency in operation that is shown by the Santa Fé, the Lackawanna, or the Union Pacific, we would be forced to agree with the negative that the present system was a success. But, Honorable Judges, such is not the case. Something is wrong. We have no fault to find with the operation of thirty-five per cent. of our inter-state railroads. But we do take exception to the financial management of all. W. Jett Lauck, an economist, says, "The

management of our railroads is divided into two parts: The operating management, which has been superb, and the financial management which is as censurable as the other has been commendable." Honorable Judges, it is commendable operation versus piratical manipulation. To-day, one-sixth of the total railway mileage of the United States is in the hands of receivers. In the West, the great roads, the Missouri Pacific, "Frisco," Rock Island, and "Katy," have depreciated in value over \$320,000,000. In the East, the Wabash, the C., H. & D., and the Père Marquette have depreciated over \$500,000,000. The grand total of depreciation to-day equals over \$1,000,000,000.

Not only is this true but from 1876 to 1915 there have been 760 receiverships and re-organizations in which nearly every one of the great railway systems of the country has in some way been connected. In all these years of private operation accompanied by the rise and fall of railroads, not a single financial corporation has been injured. Out of the débris from time to time has arisen the Goulds, Vanderbilts, Harrimans, and Morgans with their three, four, and five hundred million dollar fortunes. In each of these cases of bankruptcy, the stockholders were the ones to suffer. Those 2,000,000 stockholders, Honorable Judges, that the negative wish to befriend by continuing the present policy so that they can still be robbed by Wall Street manipulation and speculation.

Small wonder, Honorable Judges, that to-day the American public is looking upon private ownership of our

railways with suspicion. Small wonder that public opinion is unwilling to return to the railroads a freer hand in the increase of rates and privileges. Small wonder that President Ripley should say that every man's hand from the President's down is raised against the railroads. Honorable Judges, the American people have just grounds to be suspicious.

The present policy has failed because it has not placed finance upon a sound basis. It will take billions to finance the present and immediate future, but uncertainty pervades the railroad market as never before. Lippman, editor of the *New Republic*, says, "The investing public has lost faith in the worth of railway securities." In view of this the expediency of the hour demands that we step forward with government ownership.

The present policy has failed also in that it has not established an equitable, uniform rate system. There is not a railroad commission to-day but that has fixed the same rate for the same commodity, for the same distance over competing roads. This has been fair. But one road by the introduction of more efficient methods gets the larger percentage of the business, while the other road through unsatisfactory service gradually becomes poor. To lower the rate of the rich road and increase that of the poor road is a discrimination that is not just. Hence one railway enriches itself while the other goes into bankruptcy. Lippman says, "The rate making of the great railroad industry is a public function. It can never be satisfactory under the existing conditions."

The present policy has failed again in that private

ownership and operation has not built for permanency and durability but for financial returns. Honorable Judges, the reason why government construction costs more is because of the fact that it is built to last. It has been built for the sole object of being a benefit to the public. A private company or corporation could probably have constructed the Panama Canal or the irrigation projects cheaper than the government has built them. But in no case would they have built them so substantially and durably. Mr. Kenna, former vice-president of the Santa Fé, says, "Private construction is notoriously unsubstantial. It is cheap and expensive and is measured by the financial returns upon it."

The present system has failed also in that it has permitted an unhealthful concentration of capital into a few private hands. John Moody, an economist, says, "In 1908 there were eight men who controlled two-thirds of the railway mileage and over \$9,000,000,000 of its capitalization." He says further, "In 1908 the corporate power in the hands of the new Standard Oil-Morgan combination totaled over \$31,000,000,000. This combine controls more than fifty-five per cent. of the big business of the country." According to a recent article in the *New York World*, J. P. Morgan has recently returned from England with \$1,000,000,000 worth of American railroad securities that were foreign owned up until this time. Honorable Judges, such concentration of wealth into private hands is dangerous and finds no approval in political economy. In the face of such damaging evidence we contend that the present policy has utterly failed.

Secondly, the federal government should own the interstate railroads, because,

II. The continuance of the present policy affords no hope for the future.

Regulation has finally succeeded in making itself felt, but in its path of justice no hope for the future needs of the public can be found. Of the amounts necessary for the financing of the railroads for increased facilities, such as additional trackage, enlarged terminals, and increased equipment, within the next twenty-five years, the estimates vary. Howard Elliott of the New Haven has estimated the amount necessary to be \$25,000,000,000. Mr. Kenna, a close student of the railway problem, has estimated this amount to be not less than \$30,000,000,000. The New York Chamber of Commerce has estimated that it will take not less than \$8,500,000,000 to finance each five year period, totaling the sum of forty-two and one-half billion dollars.

Honorable Judges, this amount is startling, yet this is the problem in the exact terms of the present and future needs. Think of sixty or seventy-five times the price of the Panama Canal being expended within the next twenty-five years! The question then logically arises,—Can the railroads finance the problems of the immediate future? President Felton of the Chicago and Great Western says that unless the railroads are given a free hand they cannot secure the amount necessary. Crowell, of the New York Chamber of Commerce, says that the railroads cannot borrow the capital necessary for financing the present, let alone the future.

Schiff, President of the M., K. & T., says that under the present system of regulation, the securing of money necessary for improvements is impossible. Kenna, the economist, says that to secure the amount necessary under existing conditions is an impossibility.

Under such circumstances, Honorable Judges, what is to be done? The railroads say that they can do this only if they are given a free hand. That this cannot be done is plainly evident. Regulation, poor as it is, is here to stay. Senator Underwood told the railway men of the country at a New York banquet a few weeks ago that the railroads must accept more regulation than ever, and unless they were able to satisfy the public sentiment, the government would have to take over the roads. Speaking of the increase in rates granted to the railroads by the Inter-state Commerce Commission in 1914, Corwin, an economist, says, "The Interstate Commerce Commission, in response to the growing demand of the country for increased transportation facilities, granted the railroads a five per cent. increase on their interstate rates. But there are unmistakable signs in evidence to divert the proceeds of the National Commission's award into pockets for which it was never intended.' We may rest assured that no new railway trackage and no new rolling stock will ever spring into being."

Honorable Judges, that is the situation exactly. Grant to the railroads a freer hand and you make regulation a farce and swell private fortunes. Make regulation felt and the railroad men complain of their pitiful plight. As long as private ownership exists, it must do so solely upon

the proposition of making dividends. A satisfying public service is but an incident to the making of financial returns. Under such a system the cycle of boom and receivership will go on making possible the amassing of private fortunes. This, Honorable Judges, is the system that made it possible for the syndicate of Gould, Schiff, Stillman, and Harriman to secure control of the Chicago and Alton Railroad. As officers of the company they watered its stock one hundred and thirty-three per cent. and sold the bonds to themselves at sixty-five cents on the dollar. Then, as individuals, they turned about and sold those same bonds for over \$300 apiece to the insurance and trust companies that they controlled. It was under this same system, Honorable Judges, that the Wabash Railroad, a \$225,000,000 property, sold for \$18,000,000 at public auction in St. Louis a few months ago.

In the face of this review, there is nothing in the present system that affords the least hope or encouragement for the future, save the adoption of government ownership.

Then again the federal government should own the inter-state railroads, because,

III. Government ownership will mean an economic saving.

The affirmative believes that the public welfare is the supreme law. If government ownership of our railroads will mean an economic saving to our people together with an adequate and a satisfactory service, it is obvious that this saving should be theirs. If the government owned the railroads, the future increase in land values would

belong to the government instead of to private companies. Bogart's "Economic History" tells us that the federal and state governments have given to the railroads 214,000,000 acres of land. That this land has increased in value since the time of its granting, no one denies. The value of this land at the grant price of \$1.25 per acre, is \$267,000,000. Interest at four per cent. on this sum for 50 years equals \$535,000,000. In connection with this increase in land values, note the following concrete cases. A unanimous opinion of the United States Supreme Court says that the original cost of the lands of the Northern Pacific at the three terminals in St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Duluth including all purchases to April 30, 1908, was \$4,527,228. Without any increased expenditure the property was valued by the company at \$17,385,869. Upon this vast sum which represented more than three hundred and eighty per cent. of the cost, the railroad was allowed to pay dividends.

Likewise in the case of the C., B. & Q. Ry. According to a unanimous opinion of the Inter-State Commerce Commission, the original cost of the property was \$258,000,000. The company has expended in money \$122,000,000 and insists that the law entitles it to a return upon the present value estimated by the company at \$530,000,000. According to this, the increase in land value has amounted to \$150,000,000. Honorable Judges, when we consider that the state and federal governments have given to the railroads an acreage of land more than four times as large as the State of Kansas, and allowed them to claim dividends upon this vast sum of unearned wealth, it is easy to see

why railroad rates are high. The railroads not only want rates to pay the interest on railway stock, but on all the land that the government has given them. The Interstate Commerce Commission states that the C., B. & Q. property represents less than one-fortieth of the railroad capitalization of the country. If, Honorable Judges, the same ratio holds for other roads as for the Burlington, the unearned increment, the increase in land and property value alone would amount to the enormous sum of \$6,000,000,000, or almost one-half the total value of all the railroad property in the United States. Honorable Franklin K. Lane, ex-chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, says, "In the face of such an economic philosophy, if stable and equitable rates are to be maintained, it would be wise for the federal government to protect its people by taking to itself these properties at their present value, rather than await the day, perhaps thirty or fifty years hence, when they will have multiplied ten or twenty fold."

That a unification of our railroad system is necessary to effect economy is self-evident. That this can never come about through private ownership is also plain. The wastes of competition and bankruptcy can be eliminated in no other way except by government ownership. Cooley, an ex-member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, says, "The more completely the whole railway system of the country can be under one management, the greater will be the benefits of its service to the public." Edgar E. Clark, a member of the present Interstate Commerce Commission, says, "If the railroads of the United States were owned by the government, there would be great

economies as compared with the present competitive situation." Clifford Thorne, chairman of the Iowa Board of Railroad Commissioners, says, "The private ownership of the American railways is costing us more than \$400,000,000 annually."

Honorable Judges, when wastes by competition are so great; duplicated lines unnecessary; rates high, and receiverships an annual affair, the affirmative contend that public ownership would mean an economic saving to the country.

Lastly, the federal government should own the interstate railroads, because,

IV. Government ownership is sound in theory.

That something has long been wrong in the relation between the public and the railroad interests is plainly evident. The purpose of the Interstate Commerce Commission has been to convert the privately owned lines of railroad into a satisfactory public agency. It was assumed by the government that this could be done without doing any injustice to the owners of railroad securities or losing any of the advantages of private ownership, but the experience of the last eight years has shown this theory to be a failure. The resulting railroad situation to-day combines all the disadvantages of private and public ownership with none of the advantages of either. The responsibility is divided. Neither the railway officials nor the government has that essential element of good administration, the unified combination of responsibility with power. Regulation is at best a compromise measure. It represents the ignominious effort of our government to

regulate its taxing power that it has leased out to Wall Street barons. Regulation represents an attempt to maintain equilibrium between two opposing forces. The difference in aims between these two causes a never ceasing conflict. If regulation is lax as it has been in the past, then the public pays an enormous tribute in the form of colossal fortunes to unscrupulous railway promoters. If regulation makes itself felt as at present, then the railroad men complain that their business is being bled white. Theoretically and practically speaking, regulation has failed. It merely lanced the sore where amputation was needed. It has satisfied neither the railroads nor the public. Now Honorable Judges, since the present policy is a compromise and is wrong in principle, it becomes evident that no middle ground can be occupied. Le Rossignol, political scientist, says, "There is no alternative between public and private ownership, inasmuch as public control is merely a step toward public ownership." Richard T. Ely, political scientist, says, "The railways must become still more completely our masters, or they must be reduced to subjection to us as their masters. There is no middle ground."

The affirmative contend that government ownership is sound in theory. When the railroads of our land are operated by the public both the political government and the railway management are working with precisely the same object in view—that of the best possible service at the lowest possible cost. This unified responsibility and purpose is sound in both political theory and economy. To say that a system of public ownership would be domi-

nated by politics, is but the cry of an alarmist. None of the nations that have nationalized their roads have had such an experience. We have to-day over 500,000 men in the governmental service. They vote independently, and they are found in all the political parties. To add to this number 1,700,000 more from the railway service would mean that only two and two-tenths per cent. of our population would be in government employ. With over ninety-seven per cent. of our population in private life, political domination is a mere bugaboo. If to nationalize our railroads means but the enrollment of the railway employees into an army of political Hessians ready at all times to obey the dictates of their political superiors, then we should avoid government ownership. Honorable Judges, if you have any faith in the American character you must believe that this is the last thing that they would stoop to do. To say that public ownership would be characterized by inefficiency is but giving voice to a something that has no existence in the facts of American life. Nationalize the railroads and make efficiency a moral issue in railroad life and you will find that the American people will rise to meet the responsibility. Kenna says, "History shows no instance where employees that are efficient, economical, and industrious in private employ suddenly become corrupt, lazy, and inefficient when their employer becomes the State."

Thus Honorable Judges, the affirmative rest the opening presentation of their case. I have shown you that the present policy has failed. That it affords no hope for the solution of the problems of the present and future. I

have furthermore shown you that government ownership will mean an economic saving, and that it is sound in theory.

My colleague will present to you in turn the case by which the railroads can be acquired by the government. Also he will point out the futility of retaining any form of private ownership. He will also show you that an efficient management under all conditions is assured under government ownership.

As a concluding word, Honorable Judges, let us never forget that if we must perhaps call a government paternal because it does its bounden duty of controlling the nation's highways, it is infinitely better to have a paternal government of all, than that all should be paternally governed by one for the interests of one.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, HOWARD WHITE, SOUTHWESTERN
COLLEGE, '16

Gentlemen of the decision: We cannot accept the interpretation placed upon this question by the gentlemen of the opposition. If we did, there would be but one side to this question. It would be no longer debatable and there would be no honor for the gentlemen of the opposition in convincing you, Honorable Judges, that the federal government should not own and operate all interstate railroads. We of the affirmative argue for this proposition and believe that the common, every-day interpretation of the term "interstate railroads" should apply in this debate. This term is one with which we are all familiar and to try to place a technical interpretation

on a commonly-used phrase clearly would defeat the purpose of this debate; namely, to discuss the merits and demerits of government ownership of interstate railroads. Why "interstate railroads"? For two reasons: the federal government could not constitutionally own and operate those railroads doing a purely local business; and further, it would be impractical for the federal government to try to operate such roads, even if it could do so legally. For these two reasons the question is stated as it is.

In its transportation problem, America is confronted by a condition, not a theory. Preparedness for a constructive program of peace, as well as for efficient communication in possible ways, depends on an intelligent solution of this problem. Summarizing the unescapable facts pointed out by my colleague, we find that there is an ever-increasing demand for improved transportation facilities. This demand is not heeded because money cannot be obtained. The investing public has been alienated by the combined forces of financial mismanagement and restrictive legislation, the former perpetually diverting money from improvements to build up private fortunes, the latter developing to check this exploitation of a public necessity. Furthermore, the existence of fortunes made by a few financiers creates envy among the employees, who demand a larger share of the profits, and impels shippers to oppose with all their power, every demand for increased rates.

With our railroads becoming unfit to meet even ordinary needs of transportation, with a growing recognition, even among the railway men themselves, of the utter inability

to cope with any extraordinary task, either of peace or of war, we must face the question: Can private ownership, in any form, rise to meet the emergency?

Due regard for a system which has had many advantages in the past compels us to move slowly before pronouncing its doom. Yet we must state the issue in terms of the future. Not what privately-owned roads have done in the past but what they promise for the future is our issue. Private ownership promises nothing unless one of two radical changes is made: less regulation, or governmental guarantee of dividends. Less regulation is unthinkable. Bitter experience has taught the futility of trusting those interested in securing the largest dividends with operating the railways unselfishly, for the greatest national welfare. To ask the public to relinquish its authority over the arteries of its commerce is a waste of breath. On the other hand, the railway men are emphatic that any extension, or even a retention, of the public's authority over their properties must be accompanied by a guarantee of returns. In justice to the railway owners, the public should assume some financial responsibility for the regulatory measures which it imposes. But were their dividends guaranteed, there is no reason to believe that our experience would differ materially from that of France, Germany, Austria and Italy, all of which found, according to Samuel D. Dunn, editor of the *Railway Age Gazette*, that "these guarantees impaired the incentive to enterprising management" and as a result these nations soon purchased outright the railroads whose returns they had guaranteed. Hence the opposition, if

they were inclined to argue the merits of this question, would not propose this change, even though it might afford a temporary relief, because it has proved only a stepping stone to public ownership.

Since privately-owned railroads cannot hope for less regulation nor obtain governmental guarantee of their dividends, we must turn to public ownership and operation as the only reasonable solution. The expediency of nationalizing America's railways is obscured by two misconceptions: First, the mistaken idea as to cost; Second, the fear of incompetent service.

Opponents of public ownership spread the idea that the federal government would have to create a debt of fifteen to twenty billion dollars to secure title to the railways. However, all that would be needed at first would be a controlling interest in the stock of the thirty-five leading companies, which according to Edward Dudley Kenna, in his book, "Railway Misrule" own practically all interstate lines. Note that term, Honorable Judges, "interstate lines." In the appendix of this book, Mr. Kenna lists these "interstate lines" which the opposition says are practically non-existent and Mr. Kenna, a practical railroad man, finds that these lines include almost 200,000 miles of track, fully three-fourths of the railway mileage of the nation. A controlling interest in the roads would cost not more than \$2,100,000,000 if stock were purchased at the highest prices quoted during the past year. The minority stockholders would surely not object to this change in control from a group of irresponsible Wall Street financiers to the responsible agent of the public.

With this control secured, the government could gradually take over the remainder of the stock, paying for it, as Germany and other nations have done, a price determined by its market value for a period of years before the government entered the field. The various bond issues could be taken over, either when they mature or sooner, exchanging government bonds for them.

This does not mean the creation of an enormous debt. It is merely the assumption by the government of obligations already existing which have, as security, the vast railway properties, the circulatory system of our nation. It merely removes a liability from private companies with their varying degrees of trustworthiness to the one great public corporation whose reliability is beyond question. Reliability is absolutely necessary. To secure it, our national credit must be staked against the alluring fields of speculative investments in war stocks and European securities to prevent the withdrawal of capital from productive industry. The billion dollars in American securities, largely railway stocks and bonds, which J. Pierpont Morgan brought from England two weeks ago, adds a heavy burden to the already overloaded market for railway securities. To prevent a disastrous slump because of the increasing uncertainty of returns even without this enormous extra load, and more necessary yet, to secure additional capital for the coming era of railway expansion, which my colleague has outlined, the powerful force of our national credit must be used to make investments in our national highways secure and certain of fair return.

But even with the railways publicly-owned, with the

nation's credit bringing in money for much-needed improvements, the affirmative cannot rest its case until it answers the question: Is it reasonably certain that public ownership will give the United States a better service than private ownership can promise?

I grant that the unified operation of over 200,000 miles of railway is confronted by many difficulties. But that these are insurmountable, or even as great as private ownership is facing and must face within the next few years, if it is to give our nation adequate transportation facilities, this I do not admit. Furthermore, I concede that if our railways are to be developed only by the prospect of the fortune of a Vanderbilt or a Gould as a reward, then public ownership is doomed to failure. But with the remarkable achievement of Colonel Goethals and his helpers before us, I challenge the opposition to name any man, in any private enterprise who, incited by the hope of millions, ever rendered the public a more conscientious, enduring, economical service, freer from charges of misusing the funds entrusted to his care.

A national system is more efficient because it does away with the wastes of competition. Traffic will be sent over the shortest route. Train service will not be duplicated. Discrimination to induce shipping over a certain line will be useless. From these and other economies, experts estimate a saving as high as twenty per cent. of the total operating expenses. (Kenna, p. 111.) Combine this annual saving of \$400,000,000 with \$120,000,000 (Dunn, "Government Ownership" p. 68) saved in lower interest rates and there is a half-billion dollars every year to com-

pensate for any tendency to equip trains with full crews and give a service whose aim is public welfare rather than private gain.

Public ownership of the railways insures a much more honest, efficient service because of the inherent difference in motives. Harriman set out to make a fortune and to build up a great railway system. This being his motive, we must admire the skill of a man who could outwit his rivals and, by methods usually within the law, make himself master of millions of dollars and thousands of miles of track. Such conduct can never be expected from a public railway officer, because the question of ownership being permanently settled, it is useless to strive for a private fortune by stock manipulation. Is the elimination of this one motive harmful to honest management? Not at all. The Harrimans and Goulds are confronted by immeasurably greater temptations to turn a public service to their own ends. As a railway president Colonel Goethals could doubtless equal Harriman as a plunger. But imagine him, if you can, as a public servant, entering Wall Street to speculate in Canal stock. Imagine if you can any one of the men who have had charge of the vast reclamation projects in the arid West, imagine them trying to build up private fortunes by constructing makeshift irrigation systems which would hold water only until the last share of watered stock is marketed. The very fact that they have no reason to think of a management which makes a private fortune possible leaves them free for the undoubted duty of their position: the rendering of an efficient public service.

Finally, nationalized railways will give Americans a common interest, will make us truly national, whether fighting with the tools of war for our preservation as a nation and in defense of humanity, or using the tools of peace in the most efficient manner which our great natural endowments require.

In the first place, we cannot ignore, through a sense of security, the need of a unified, nationally-directed railway system as a measure of preparedness for war. "Railways," says the *London Times*, "are the most powerful weapon in the armament of nations." Governmental direction of the railways in times of national crises is imperative. A brigadier general, now in Mexico, who requests that his name be not publicly quoted, writes, "The superior efficiency of government-owned railways, from a military point of view, is fully recognized by military men. . . . If all the railways were owned and controlled by the government, their war efficiency would be greatly increased." Germany's example is classic. Its railways, publicly-owned for forty years, have accomplished marvelous feats in transfers of troops and munitions, preventing invasions from all sides. Yet England and France, waiting until the outbreak of war to unify control, have handled amounts of men and supplies which would have been impossible in times of peace when each railway was a law unto itself, operating to secure the highest dividends.

Must we of America wait for the grim reality of war to take our railways, in all their multiplicity, and mould them into one strong, efficient system, but only, as with France, after the enemy has crossed our borders? Why

must we tolerate the wasteful, inefficient methods, inseparable from composite ownership until war makes centralization imperative? The railroads, fighting among themselves for larger shares of the traffic; too local in their interests to give uniform service to all communities; unable, even if willing, to serve the whole nation because of the friction between state and federal commissions, one forbidding this, another ordering that, accomplishing nothing constructive—these perpetual conflicts all arising because the American railways are not operated as a unit but as competing systems—surely this condition calls for a unified system which will take the excess in one part to apply to the deficiency in another and will operate the railways of America for the best interests of the whole nation, even in peace.

FINAL AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, HOWARD WHITE,
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: No one regrets more than do we the peculiar form the debate has taken this evening because of the interpretation which the negative persist in trying to apply to this question. It is not as if there were nothing else for them to do. There are many weighty arguments which can be advanced why government ownership of the railways should not be. All lovers of clashing arguments therefore regret that the gentlemen of the opposition did not see fit to match them against the arguments which we of the affirmative have presented.

But if they are going to quibble over the fine points of the question, we can go one step farther. They said

there were a few interstate railroads. We suggest that they should have argued that there are no interstate railroads. The word "interstate" means between states. Therefore an interstate road must be one that runs "between" the states. In order that a railroad should be interstate, therefore, it must have its tracks "between" two states, as, for instance, Kansas and Oklahoma. But since one state begins where the other ends, a railroad must necessarily be in one or the other state. The road is therefore wholly intra-state since it is contrary to the laws of geometry that any portion of it can be "between" the two states or "interstate." The gentlemen forgot to consider this weighty argument which would materially have strengthened their contention.

I must repeat that the reasons for using the classification, "all interstate railroads" are because the federal government cannot constitutionally deal with a railroad that does not do an interstate business and that it would be impractical for the federal government to try to operate a small line doing a purely local business. But the gentlemen of the negative have given a definition of what they consider this term "interstate railroads" means. We do not accept their definition and submit that the term applies to those railroads forming integral parts of systems which have lines extending across state lines. Another definition which gives the commonly accepted meaning of "interstate railroads" looks to the business which the road in question does and declares that a railroad doing interstate business or engaging in interstate commerce is, to all intents, an interstate railroad. The first definition is, how-

ever, the one commonly accepted by practical men and I have quoted Edward Dudley Kenna, for seven years vice-president of the Santa Fé, who lists fully three-fourths of the railway mileage of the United States as "interstate" because it is in one or another of the great railway systems whose property extends beyond the boundaries of any one state.

And now let me remind you, gentlemen of the decision, that public ownership is being seriously considered. Leading Senators and Congressmen of all parties, including Senators Borah, Cummins, Kenyon, Norris, Clapp and Poindexter, are favorably inclined toward public ownership. Railway men who believe nationalization a calamity unite with men who believe it beneficial in predicting the inevitableness of government ownership. As I asked in my main speech: Can public policy retain the present companies and give them another chance? Let them, perhaps, route all business as it should be routed and thus institute a great saving? The vice-president of a great railway system answers, "Should the public grant railway companies the privilege of doing business in the most economical way, the companies would still have to be coerced into doing it that way." Clearly, centralization is forced on us by the very nature of things. President Hadley of Yale says, "The railways are almost necessarily a monopoly." The only question is: What sort of a monopoly shall we have? A private monopoly, regulated, to be sure, but still with interests colliding with the public, or a public monopoly, working in harmony with the interests of the whole people? The German Cabinet

answered in 1879, "To place complete control of all means of transportation in the hands of one enormous, profit-seeking corporation would be antagonistic to every public interest." Samuel O. Dunn says: "It seems improbable that the public will ever consent to the merger of all railways while their ownership is private." Isaac L. Rice, in the *North American Review*, says, "Even if it were possible, theoretically to frame laws controlling a great railway monopoly and making it responsible to the people; practically, such laws would either not be framed or would not be enforced, owing to the tremendous power the monopolist would wield." But even granting that government could make its authority felt over the giant corporation, the objection of Richard Olney, former Secretary of State, still holds: "When the government gets so far as to dictate the prices a corporation may charge for what it sells and to fix the capital it may invest in its business, and to prescribe the securities by which that capital is to be raised, government ownership has, in effect, arrived." The affirmative's arguments have been in harmony with this statement. We have endeavored to show that the present system comes so near government ownership, is such a hybrid system, if you please, that it contains almost all the disadvantages of both public and private ownership with few of the advantages of either. We propose that intelligent steps be taken toward the goal whither we are tending. We protest against that temporizing which holds onto a system which events plainly have marked for destruction, which holds on blindly and consequently, when the time arrives and na-

tionalization becomes imperative, we, as a nation, must then pay the price of blindly drifting. Rather, should we face the conditions as they exist and, retaining the many valuable features peculiar to American industry, we will confidently and unequivocally make the railway service truly national.

Gentlemen of the decision, in the clash of arguments this evening, you have heard many conflicting statements. Seemingly, two different questions have been debated. Experience teaches that a desire to win often leads debaters, unconsciously, to misconstrue facts and distort seemingly plain statements. Quite naturally, you put question marks after many assertions made in debate.

To remove any misunderstanding which may have arisen as to the position of the affirmative, let me sum up our main contentions.

We have admitted that there are many admirable features in the present operating management of our railways; that public ownership is not a panacea for all ills. Approaching the question in this way, we have found that the wasteful methods which attend competitive operation lay heavy burdens on industry; that financial mismanagement is inseparable from private ownership of such a great public necessity; that unearned values are added to real costs and dividends charged against the whole; that the railways are unable to finance necessary repairs, much less provide adequate facilities for the future. In considering remedial changes we have found modifications of the present system are only temporizing measures which really lead nearer to public ownership. Taking up na-

tionalization, not as a radical proposal of visionary socialists, but as a logical and expedient, yet permanent solution of present difficulties, we have found: (1) Acquisition is not difficult; (2) The national credit will enable transportation to expand with growing industry; (3) Centralization will remove the wastes of competition and will retain efficient operating management, while removing all incentive for financial mismanagement through speculation in railway stocks; and finally, government ownership is an essential measure of preparedness for either peace or war, giving Americans a vital common interest which will inspire ideals of efficiency and will make us truly national.

FIRST NEGATIVE, FRED D. FAGG, JR., UNIV. OF REDLANDS, '19

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentleman who has just left the floor has pointed out in an able way the evils of the present system of railway transportation. The negative wishes to grant that there are a number of evils existing under our present method of controlling railway transportation. But we desire to point out that it is not incumbent upon the negative to defend the present method. The statement of the question, Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all interstate railroads, in no way demands that the negative uphold the present conditions. Therefore, Honorable Judges, the time which our opponent has spent in attacking the present system has been wasted as far as our discussion to-night is concerned, for the question at issue is ~~not the~~ success or failure of the present method, but

whether or not federal ownership and operation of all the interstate railroads is more desirable and practicable than any other plan which might be devised.

Before entering into a discussion of the merits of respective plans let us carefully analyze the proposition for debate this evening and see just exactly what it means. Resolved, that the United States should own and operate all interstate railroads. Manifestly this is a proposition of government ownership, but notice, gentlemen, that it is a proposition of limited government ownership. The negative, then, under the terms of the question is not obliged to attack the principles of government ownership but is obliged to attack the definite scheme of limited government ownership which the gentlemen of the affirmative are advocating. The word, "interstate," as used in this question indicates that some of the railroads in our country, namely the intra-state railroads, are not to be included in the affirmative plan. The effect of the question, then, is to divide our railroad system into two classes, those which would be owned and operated by our federal government, the interstate roads, and those which would be owned and operated by private corporations, the intra-state railroads.

The questions naturally arise — what are interstate railroads and what are intra-state railroads? An interstate railroad is one whose trackage crosses a state boundary line, and an intra-state railroad is one whose trackage lies wholly within the boundary lines of a single state. These definitions can not be disputed for the United States Supreme Court in all its decisions involving the word, "interstate," holds that it means the crossing of a state

boundary line, and that intra-state means wholly within the boundaries of a single state. Manifestly, then, an interstate railroad can not be defined as one engaging in interstate commerce for all intra-state railroads engage in interstate commerce by virtue of the fact that they are carriers of the articles of interstate commerce, which puts them under the jurisdiction of the interstate commerce commission. On the other hand all interstate railroads do intra-state business and therefore come partly under the jurisdiction of the state railroad commissions. Manifestly there is no division on a basis of commerce for all railroads are engaged in both inter- and intra-state commerce. Now, since our question implies a division of our railroads, and since there can be no division on a basis of commerce we must conclude that the division is based upon the fact of trackage crossing a state line as the decisions of the Supreme Court imply.

Having seen, Honorable Judges, that the question for discussion demands the division of our railroads into two classes, we wish to ask our opponents why they consider it necessary to make this division. The negative can see only one justification for such action and that is that government ownership of interstate railroads might be the best solution of the transportation problem. It is our contention to-night that this plan is not the best solution. There are three plans of action confronting us for consideration. They are: First, private ownership and operation of all the railroads with adequate government regulation. This implies certain changes in the laws and methods of regulation to meet the evils existing at the present

time. Second, federal ownership and operation of all the railroads of the United States. Third, federal ownership and operation of the interstate railroads.

The duty of the affirmative is to prove that the last named plan, the federal ownership of part of our railroads, is the superior plan. To accomplish this they must prove that their plan is the most effective in reaching the evils, the most advantageous to the public, to the government and to railroad operation; and the most practicable of all plans. Honorable Judges, we call attention to the fact that the burden of proof rests with the gentlemen of the affirmative, and that, unless they can prove these points, they fail to sustain their contention.

The duty of the negative is to prove that federal ownership of interstate railroads is inferior as a solution of the transportation problem to either private ownership with adequate regulation or government ownership of all railroads.

Let us now turn our attention to a study of the affirmative plan? The affirmative plan of taking merely the interstate railroads is not the best plan because it fails to recognize the economic principle of unity in our railroad transportation. Our opponents can not deny that the scientific handling of the traffic of the country demands that the transportation system be operated as a unit. Neither can they deny the fact that private ownership of the railroads is furnishing this unity. For instance, the railroads coöperate in the handling of freight, of mail, of passenger service and through train service, in the division of profits, in quotation of rates, and in many other matters. All

this has been for the benefit of the public. Moreover, the government has been regulating and controlling railroad transportation as a unit through the interstate commerce commission. So we see that under a system of private ownership and regulation unity is maintained. Also, Honorable Judges, if the government owned all the railroads unity would still be preserved. However, the proposition of the affirmative does not include all the railroads but is a proposition to disrupt the present unity and give us two bases of ownership and operation diametrically opposed to one another. Now manifestly government ownership and private ownership can not and will not coöperate for it is not the policy of the United States, and has never been the policy of the United States, to coöperate with private enterprise. Furthermore, we have no reason to believe that the policy of the government will change when it has acquired the interstate railroads. It is a settled fact, however, that unless it does change its policy when the interstate railroads are acquired our railway service will be injured. We believe that the policy our government has always maintained in refusing to coöperate with private ownership in industrial undertakings is fundamentally correct and should not be abandoned, especially when government ownership of all the railroads or private ownership of all under government regulation would both be in harmony with the settled policy of the United States, and neither would disrupt the transportation system. Thus it seems to the negative that in the point of unity in the operation of our railway system that either of these two plans is superior to the

plan which the affirmative is advocating. And right here we would like to ask the gentlemen to prove that this hybrid form of ownership of the railroads which they propose is superior to either of the unified methods which we have suggested. Moreover, we'd like to ask them to show, if they believe in the principles of government ownership, why they do not advocate government ownership of all the railroads in the United States? Further, we'd like to ask them to point out any merits in the division of the railroads which they advocate that are not possessed and greatly exceeded in government ownership of all the railroads.

Now in the second place, Honorable Judges, the affirmative plan of government ownership of interstate railroads is not the best plan because it would occasion a serious complication not existent under either of the other two plans. This complication arises in the fact that the action which the affirmative advocates would not abolish any of the instruments or machinery of regulation which our opponent has so earnestly attacked. Government ownership of interstate railroads instead of being a solution of transportation problems would merely add a new element to the present system of government control. For instance, the interstate commerce commission could not be abolished. Its existence and authority would be necessary to regulate the intra-state railroads which do interstate business. It would have to have as much authority over those railroads as it does to-day, and its existence would be imperative to insure the harmony of such railway operation. The state commissions would

have to be retained to regulate commerce and railway affairs within state domain. The affirmative, then, have not abolished regulation nor the necessity of regulation; they have merely added a complication. Under regulation we should have a unified system of control. This would also be the case under government ownership of all the railroads, but under the affirmative plan there would necessarily be a mixed control. The railroads would not be upon a basis of equality, for the government owned railroads would be on one footing and the private owned railroads on another. This mixed control would naturally occasion endless conflict and would destroy the unity and coöperation of our railway system. Thus we see that the affirmative are offering us two bases of ownership and a mixed control by federal and state commission and federal ownership. To-day only three of the above five factors are existent, and under federal ownership of all the railroads only two would be existent. When under these two plans we would have at most three factors, do the gentlemen of the affirmative actually consider that their plan would solve our transportation problem when it does not abolish any instrument of regulation but on the other hand only complicates the matter?

In the third place, Honorable Judges, the affirmative plan of government ownership is not the best plan because it is based on an artificial division of the railroads. It is artificial, first, because the basis of division is state boundary lines. The idea that these United States are a collection of states and not a unified nation has long since

ceased to exist. Why should we put the distinction between private ownership and federal ownership on such false lines? Should a river, a mountain range, or a barb wire fence determine which road should be owned and operated by the federal government? This is not a practical division if a division is necessary, and we firmly believe that any division of our railroad system will only increase complications and thus prove to be impracticable.

It is artificial, secondly, because the Supreme Court has never recognized this division. I challenge the gentlemen of the affirmative to quote a single case on record based upon such distinction.

It is artificial in the third place, because in the entire history of our interstate commerce commission no dispute has arisen over this question. The commission deals only with interstate commerce and that does not determine interstate railroads. The state commissions also fail to recognize that such a division exists.

It is artificial in the fourth place because the railroad men of our country do not consider this basis to be the line of demarcation. In talking with railroad authorities we find that interstate railroads are theoretically possible but that such a basis of division is not recognized in practical business operation. F. H. Dixon of the Bureau of Railway Economics, says, "So far no classification between intra-state and interstate railways has been used."

In the last place, our leading economists and statesmen in discussing our transportation problem do not deal with government ownership of interstate railroads. They either advocate private ownership with adequate regula-

tion or federal ownership of all the railroads in our country.

From this it is apparent, Honorable Judges, that the affirmative are advocating a plan of ownership and control that is artificial, theoretical, unbusinesslike and unchampioned by competent authorities.

In conclusion, Honorable Judges, let us sum up the negative contentions thus far in this debate. I have endeavored to give you the only fair interpretation of this question. I have shown that the affirmative plan means a division of the railroads into inter- and intra-state groups and that, first, this division would destroy the unity of our transportation whereas the plans which we have suggested preserve that unity. I have shown in the second place that the affirmative division of the railroads introduces complications into our system of control instead of abolishing regulation, whereas the plans which the negative have offered give a unified system of control. I have shown in the third place that the affirmative division of our railroads is the artificial one of state lines, is unrecognized in business procedure and unadvocated by competent authority, whereas the plans which the negative have suggested treat our railroad system as a unit, are based upon business procedure and are advocated by competent authority. Lastly, I have shown that the affirmative plan of government ownership of interstate railroads is unjust and unfair to private business because it forces operation on an unequal basis with the government-owned interstate roads, and to the public because it hampers efficient railroad transportation.

Finally, Honorable Judges, we ask our opponents why it is necessary to make this division, why if we are to have any form of government ownership of railroads we do not have government ownership of all the railroads, and what the government ownership of interstate railroads will accomplish that will not be accomplished and greatly exceeded in government ownership of all the railroads? Moreover, we ask the gentlemen about this practical consideration: Shall the government operate on a cost or profit basis? How many miles out of the total mileage of our railroads shall the government take as interstate railroads? Furthermore, we ask them to name these interstate railroads. Also we would like for them to indicate the terminals, that is, where the interstate railroads begin and leave off. Honorable Judges, we insist upon an answer to these considerations.

SECOND NEGATIVE, ARTHUR JACOBSEN, UNIVERSITY OF
REDLANDS '17

Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: Thus far in this debate my colleague has shown you that the affirmative plan for government ownership of interstate railroads divides our transportation system into two classes, that this division disrupts the unity of our transportation system, complicates our methods of controlling railroads, and forces our railroads to operate in an artificial classification unrecognized in business procedure. He has suggested two well known plans of action not open to these objections, which we maintain are superior to the affirmative plan.

It is my purpose to show you that the affirmative plan is not practicable and should not be adopted. It is not practicable because it does not give the federal government complete and thorough control over the situation. Such a control is needed to operate our transportation system adequately and in the best interests of the entire public. The elimination of the intra-state railroads prevents completeness. Our opponents since they are not taking the intra-state railroads minimize their importance. It is our purpose to show you that they are not so unimportant as they might appear at first glance. We have not been able to find any statistics on the total mileage of intra-state and interstate railroads in the United States, for, as we have pointed out, railroad authorities do not recognize this artificial basis. We have discovered that there are two kinds of intra-state railroads, one class readily discernible and the other somewhat obscure yet nevertheless clearly intra-state in character. The first is composed of those lines which are operated by independent companies and are not included in any big system. Examples are the Northwestern Pacific of California, the Texas and Midland of Texas, and the Bangor and Aroostook of Maine. The second class is composed of lines operated solely within one state as branch lines and feeders of interstate railroads and as parts of the main lines of systems. Examples are the Cleveland and Zanesville of the Wabash, the Arizona and Eastern of the Southern Pacific, the Sunset, the Santa Fé, Prescott, and Phoenix, and the Texas Central of the Santa Fé.

With the help of the California Railroad Commission

we were able to get the mileage in California of the first named class of intra-state roads. This mileage is 1,262 out of a total mileage of 7,271 of all the railroads or seventeen and thirty-five hundredths per cent. This is a little more than one-sixth of the California railroad mileage and does not include the second class of intra-state roads at all. If this percentage holds for the rest of the country, and this is only reasonable, we see that under the affirmative plan a rather large proportion of our railroads would be outside the government system. We do not believe it is practicable to leave such a large part of the railroad mileage outside of government ownership. If we are going to take any, let's take all so as to gain a unified system and give all our citizens the benefits of government ownership.

The real impracticability of the affirmative plan becomes evident when we take up the second class of intra-state railroads,—those operated in connection with large systems. Practically all the main systems include innumerable branch roads and feeders operated with separate schedules, and often as separate corporations. The great railroad systems, Honorable Judges, are not often owned as one railroad, but are composed of numerous railroads both interstate and intra-state. The various railroads are held in one system in various ways. Sometimes it is by interlocking of directorates, sometimes by interholding of stock, sometimes by a system of leasing, sometimes through ownership by the same corporation. But no matter how they are held, the fact remains that these roads are intra-state and could not be taken under the affirmative

plan. This means, Honorable Judges, that practically every large system will lose several of its branches and feeders. Now since these railroad systems have been built up along business lines and in answer to business necessity it certainly would not be practicable to disrupt them into intra-state and interstate divisions as the affirmative plan would do.

But this is not all, Honorable Judges. Railroads are not allowed to operate in some states unless they incorporate there. This is true of Texas. It so happens that the Santa Fé and Southern Pacific, Colorado and Southern, and other railroads have incorporated part of their main lines as intra-state railroads in Texas. This means that the federal government under the affirmative's plan could not take the Texas sections of the main lines of these interstate roads. What this would do to traffic and through service is quite apparent. The federal government would be effectively blocked right on the main line as long as either the railroad company or the State of Texas desired to block federal ownership. If our opponents doubt these facts we refer them to the Galveston, Houston, and San Antonio railroad which is the main line of the Southern Pacific system between El Paso and San Antonio and a part of the main line from California to New Orleans. We refer them to the Pecos and Northern Texas or the Panhandle which is the main line of the Santa Fé from Texico to the Oklahoma border and part of a direct line from California to Kansas City and Chicago. In the light of these facts, Honorable Judges, would it not be better and more practicable to take all

the railroads or leave them to private ownership and regulate them all through the power over interstate commerce? Wherein lies the practicability of disrupting our railroad system?

This plan of government ownership of the interstate railroads is impracticable in the second place because it is vague and indefinite in scope and extent. It sounds perfectly clear to say that an interstate railroad is one that crosses a state line. But this definition does not seem so clear when you attempt to establish terminals. For instance, the Santa Fé runs trains from San Diego to San Francisco on a line entirely within California. However, it also runs trains from Chicago and Kansas City to San Francisco and Los Angeles over this same trackage beginning at Barstow from which place it may go to either California city. Now then, does the interstate line stop at Barstow or does it run to San Francisco or Los Angeles? This is an open question. The Santa Fé has a clear right to demand the retention of its trackage from Los Angeles to San Francisco for this is intra-state. If this contention prevails the federal owned interstate railroad is left stranded in the desert without an outlet to the coast except at the mercy of the Santa Fé. If the federal government prevails the Santa Fé is robbed of its intra-state trackage. Evidently this matter would have to go into the courts and be fought out in years of litigation if the Santa Fé was indisposed to give up its California tracks. Honorable Judges, this case is only one of hundreds of possible ones. Where a railroad property was valuable the private companies would fight because

the terminals of interstate railroads are unavoidably vague and indefinite in innumerable cases. Where a property was not valuable they would be only too glad to unload it upon the federal government. We fail to see anything practicable in this situation. The indefiniteness of the terminals of interstate railroads would only give opportunity for further disruption of the railroad systems, further disorganization of traffic, litigation, confusion, and chaos.

The affirmative plan is impracticable in the third place because it does not give the federal government independence in the operation of the interstate lines. The federal government will be obliged to operate the interstate railroads under the handicap of having to make agreements and adjustments with private enterprise. As we have seen the government and private enterprise will each be holding an essential part of our transportation system. Neither will we be able to operate successfully without the other. The federal government will have to make agreements or enter into partnerships with private enterprise in order to get the branch roads and feeders, and to get through service in cases like Texas. It will be necessary to agree with private enterprise upon schedules and rates, and upon the collection and distribution of tariffs. This brings us to a practical difficulty. Private enterprise can not operate except on a profit basis. The people would expect the government to serve them on a cost basis as it does in the post office department. If the government ran on a cost basis how would it adjust its rates with private enterprise? On interstate rates it would

have to give the private carrier a profit on its share of the traffic. On interstate hauls where only the government road was concerned service could be furnished at cost. This would mean that towns located near each other would be placed upon an unequal basis in transportation rates. This sort of discrimination is manifestly unfair and would not be tolerated by the public. On the other hand if the government takes a profit on its interstate traffic the public will be disappointed, for it will be expecting government ownership to reduce rates. In their intra-state business the government roads would have to make a profit or ruin the private owned intra-state railroads. From this we see, Honorable Judges, that the government would not be able to do as it pleased with its own interstate railroads. It would always be hampered by the problem of unsatisfactory adjustments with private enterprise. Moreover, as my colleague has pointed out, it has never been the policy of the federal government to coöperate or enter into partnership with private enterprise. We do not believe the people of the United States would favor any such proposal. In view of these things, Honorable Judges, would it not be wiser and more practicable to have the government own all the railroads? It would then be free from all problems of adjustment with private enterprise and could operate unhampered on a cost basis or on any other basis it chose.

Having seen that the affirmative plan of government ownership of interstate railroads is impracticable, let us now consider the two plans which have been mentioned by the negative — regulation and government ownership

of all the railroads. We have tried to show that either of these two plans would be superior to the affirmative plan. Especially have we tried to show that government ownership of all the railroads would be superior to government ownership of the interstate railroads, that it would have all the merits of the affirmative plan and none of the faults. Our opponents have not denied this. They have merely tried to show that their plan is equivalent to nationalization of the railroads—a thing which is not true. We have shown that regulation and government ownership of all the railroads are superior to the affirmative plan because they treat our transportation system as a unit instead of disrupting it, because they do not complicate our methods of controlling the railroads, because they do not force our railroads to operate in an artificial classification unrecognized in business procedure, because they are practicable in operation and do not hamper the government by incompleteness, indefiniteness, and complication with private enterprise.

The policy of regulation has been attacked this evening. We have admitted that some evils exist under the present form of regulation, but have pointed out that we do not have to defend the present form. Competent authorities maintain that regulation can be improved in methods of operation until the evils now apparent are done away with. Authorities also maintain that the principle of regulation has not failed. President Wilson in his message to Congress last December made the statement that regulation of railroads was successful. Surely the President, in such an important document as a message

to Congress, would know what he was talking about. We mention these things, Honorable Judges, not because we are particularly desirous of championing regulation, but to show that authorities do not agree that regulation has failed, and to show that conditions are not so bad as to make necessary a change to such an unrecognized, theoretical, artificial, and unbusinesslike proposition as the affirmative advocate.

Now as to the second plan we have suggested, we are perfectly willing to accept government ownership of all the railroads if the people of the country desire to depart from private ownership and operation under regulation. We have shown that government ownership of all the railroads would be superior to government ownership of interstate railroads, that it would have all the merits and none of the defects of the affirmative plan. Our opponents have not denied this. We are not called upon under the terms of the question to make a choice between the two plans which we have suggested. We do maintain, however, that either of these two plans would be superior to the affirmative plan because they treat our transportation system as a unit instead of disrupting it, because they do not complicate our methods of controlling the railroads, because they do not force our railroads to operate in an artificial classification unrecognized in business procedure, because they are practicable in operation and do not hamper the government by incompleteness, indefiniteness, and complication with private enterprise. In showing that these plans are both superior in these important respects to the affirmative plan we have met the issue of

the debate and contend that one of these plans should be adopted rather than the affirmative plan.

Finally, both of these plans are advocated by students of the railroad problem and by competent authorities. There is a well defined public demand for each plan. On the other hand we have found no public demand for the affirmative plan. We have been unable to find a single authority advocating or even suggesting it. All the prominent authorities which our opponents have quoted this evening favor government ownership of all the railroads and not the limited form of government ownership which the affirmative are upholding. In the light of these facts, Honorable Judges, we maintain that the United States should not own and operate the interstate railroads.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, FRED D. FAGG, JR., UNIV. OF
REDLANDS

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have just listened to an excellent argument upon the affirmative side of the question, Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all the railroads. However, gentlemen, that is not the question for debate this evening. Referring to the contract signed by Southwestern College and the University of Redlands we find the question under discussion to be as follows, Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Manifestly, there is a vast difference between the two questions. The gentlemen of the affirmative have attempted to prove the specific by proving the general, and this can not be accomplished. Furthermore,

our opponents have accused us of debating a technicality. But, Honorable Judges, what is that technicality? We have endeavored to show you that the government should not own and operate the interstate railroads in our country, and we have sustained our contentions with proof. Is not this the duty of the negative under this question? Then where does this technicality lie? The affirmative were willing to debate this subject, in fact they proposed it. Now when we prove the impracticability of it, they say we are debating a technicality. Where is the fairness in their accusation? Are they afraid to meet this question squarely? If so why did they submit it? Are they trying to dodge the issue of limited government ownership, and convince you that the question for debate is a plan of government ownership of all the railroads? I challenge them to show a single argument in our contention that does not come wholly under the question for discussion to-night. Then if we are debating the question, let them refrain from accusing us of debating a technicality, and spend their time advocating their own hybrid plan. If it has merits let us hear them.

A moment ago the first speaker agreed to accept the burden of proof. Let them now assume it and prove that their hybrid plan is the most advantageous. The first speaker of the affirmative admitted that a unification of the railroad system is a necessity. He agreed with the statement made by the Honorable Franklin K. Lane who says, "Our railroad system is without parallel in the world because we are living as a nation and in Europe they live as communities." Now if unity is necessary, why do the

gentlemen of the affirmative advocate a plan which would disrupt this unity?

In their discussion they laid bare many evils. True, there are evils enough, but this citation of evils does not prove that their hybrid proposition would in any way remedy the existent evils. We are not defending the present system, but it indeed would be a far greater success than the proposition which they advocate.

After pointing out the fact that the negative is not obliged to attack government ownership of all railroads or defend private ownership of all, we notice that the second speaker for the affirmative proceeded to attack private ownership. Why has he not met the real issue? Why has he not tried to establish his hybrid system? Was he saving his reply until the last rebuttal when we should have no opportunity to make an answer?

We asked the gentlemen of the affirmative to answer the following eight questions, and up to this time have received no reply. First, why is a division of the railroads necessary? Second, why is the hybrid system which you advocate superior to either government ownership of all or private ownership of all the railroads? Third, why, if the principle of government ownership is satisfactory, is not government ownership of all the railroads satisfactory? Fourth, what merits are there in government ownership of interstate railroads that are not possessed and greatly exceeded in government ownership of all? Fifth, would the government operate on a cost or profit basis? Sixth, how many miles of the total mileage would the government take as interstate railroads? Seventh,

what are the names of these railroads? Eight, where will the terminals of the interstate railroads be? Are they unable to make an answer? The gentlemen have quoted such authorities as Ripley, Hill, McPherson, Schiff, Crowell, Clark, Kenna, and others, and yet can they show one instance where any of these men have advocated government ownership of interstate railroads?

They attempted to minimize the importance of the intrastate railroads at first and then when my colleague showed how vastly important they are, the gentlemen tried to sidestep by saying that the government could take all the railroads later if desirable. However, Honorable Judges, such an action is not possible, for this question does not deal with the future actions of our government but limits it to actions of to-day.

In conclusion, we of the negative maintain that the proposition as advocated by the affirmative will necessitate a division of our railroad system, that it will consequently destroy the unity, so necessary for successful operation, that it will increase complications in the control, and lastly that it is an artificial division of the transportation system which is theoretical, impracticable, unbusinesslike, and unadvocated by competent authority. Therefore, we affirm our contention and challenge the gentlemen of the affirmative to disprove it.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, ARTHUR JACOBSEN, UNIV. OF
REDLANDS

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the affirmative have thus far utterly failed to interpret

the question for debate this evening. They have contended that we should have government ownership of the railroads because our present policy has failed; because it would be an economic saving; because it has been adopted in foreign countries; and because it would rid us of the inherent evils of private ownership and give us a unified system. But the issue of the debate to-night is not government ownership; it is government ownership of interstate railroads, a plan of limited government ownership. The gentlemen have been arguing for government ownership of all the railroads, a question which is not at issue. Honorable Judges, we demand that the affirmative face the true issue. Upon our part we shall consider nothing but the real issue agreed upon in the contract for this debate, which my colleague read in your hearing.

We have shown you by the statements of prominent corporation attorneys and by Supreme Court decisions that there is a wide distinction between interstate and intrastate railroads. We have shown you that an intrastate railroad is one whose trackage lies wholly within a state, or is a unit of a large system which is organized and operated by a holding company, a unit operated, however, within a single state. Our opponents have stated that they would take practically all the railroads by taking the nine large systems. As we have seen the railroads can not be taken as systems under the terms of the question. The only possible way that this could be done would be for the government to take them upon a basis of interstate commerce. Such a basis, however, is not covered by the

term "interstate railroad" for all railroads, even the admittedly intra-state, do interstate business. It is evident, therefore, that under the question for debate the railroads can not be taken over to government ownership by systems. Only corporate units whose trackage crosses state lines may be taken.

Now, Honorable Judges, we have maintained further that the intra-state railroads which would not be included under the affirmative program constitute no small percentage of our railroad mileage. As we have said no definite figures are available as this basis of division is unrecognized in business procedure. However, we have already given the estimate of the California intra-state mileage as one-sixth of the total amount. Furthermore, I have here the official railroad guide book of the United States. In two hours time I found, in going over the various systems, that sixty per cent. of the M., K. and T. mileage was intra-state; that fifty-four and nine tenths per cent. of the Colorado and Southern, thirty-seven and twenty-five hundredths per cent. of the Southern Pacific, thirty-four and six tenths per cent. of the Salt Lake, seventeen and thirty-one hundredths per cent. of the Philadelphia and Reading, twelve per cent. of the Santa Fé, etc., were intra-state. The total mileage of the intra-state parts of these six systems which our opponents could not take is 9,262. Again, of the independent intra-state railroads one hundred and twenty were large enough to be mapped. Twenty-three such railroads in thirteen states had a mileage of 6,493. This makes a total intra-state mileage of nearly 17,000, which I collected within a few hours.

Hundreds of other intra-state railroads are listed. If time had permitted the total mileage could have been increased by several thousand miles. It would take years to obtain the exact figures, but when they were secured, we maintain that they would constitute a startling percentage. In fact, Mr. W. R. Flynn, an official of the Santa Fé system told us that the intra-state mileage would, in his opinion, constitute fully one-half of the total mileage of the country. Again, gentlemen, there would be the never ending problem of determining the terminals of intra-state and interstate portions of the various systems.

Honorable Judges, the negative maintains that it has conclusively shown that the affirmative plan of government ownership of interstate railroads would give us a gigantic hybrid system instead of a unified system, that it would introduce a multitude of complications—in short, would mean disruption to our present transportation system. Moreover, the gentlemen of the affirmative have yet to show us the necessity and the advantages of introducing such an artificial and unbusinesslike system. They have maintained that the advantages of their proposition have been established by the statements of such eminent economists as Locke, McPherson, Ely, Ripley, Lane, Hill, Corbin and others. They have even cited my friend Mr. Eshleman of the California Railroad Commission. I have a letter from him to the contrary notwithstanding, written shortly before his death. Honorable Judges, they are utterly mistaken. The authorities which they quoted favored government ownership of all the railroads, or nationalization, and not government ownership of the

interstate railroads. These men are opposed to any proposition which would disrupt our transportation system. The negative challenge,—we demand that the affirmative show us the statement of these authorities that they favor the affirmative proposal of this evening. Gentlemen, face the real issue, which is government ownership of interstate railroads.

The negative has been accused of defending regulation this evening. We merely quoted President Wilson on the subject. If the affirmative can prove to the public in the face of the president's statement that regulation has failed, then we are perfectly willing to accept government ownership of all the railroads, for we have shown that we are in no way required to oppose the latter proposition to-night.

The gentlemen have maintained that we should have government ownership of the interstate railroads because of such evils in our transportation system as discriminating rates, circuitous routing, watered stock, unhealthy concentration of power, etc. Now adequate regulation would meet these evils. Our government has not exhausted its powers of regulation. It could require all railroads doing an interstate business—and they all do—to take out a federal charter. With the chartering power, the government would have the power of life or death over the railroads. It could do anything with this power that it could with government ownership. If government ownership would cure the evils a federal charter also would. Again, Honorable Judges, if the gentlemen wished to remove these evils completely, why did they

not take all the railroads? We have shown that the intrastate railroads which they would leave unremedied constitute a large percentage of our total mileage. The gentlemen have not proposed a measure which will eliminate the evils which they have enumerated. They have only proposed to introduce a new set of complications. If government ownership of interstate railroads would abolish the evils in the railroads included, then government ownership of all the railroads would certainly do so for all, and as we have seen this would not introduce complications through an unbusinesslike, artificial, and hybrid division.

In conclusion, the negative maintains again that the issue of the debate this evening is not the merits of government ownership, it is not the shortcomings of the present system—it is the expediency and practicability of adopting a plan of government ownership limited to the interstate railroads. The gentlemen have not met this issue squarely. They have been more concerned with attacking the present system and demonstrating the merits of government ownership than they have with proving the expediency and practicability of taking the interstate railroads. We accept the principles of government ownership but point out that making a case for government ownership does not prove that the government should take the interstate railroads. Government ownership is a principle—government ownership of interstate railroads is a plan. There is a vast difference between a principle and a plan. We can not conclude that because the principle

is satisfactory, that a plan which does not put the principle into complete operation is the best plan, or that it would work. The affirmative have committed the fallacy of arguing for government ownership of all the railroads and implying that government ownership of the interstate railroads would be practically the same thing, that it would have all the merits of government ownership of all the railroads and would not introduce any complications or new evils.

Honorable Judges, we have shown you that the affirmative position is utterly false, that government ownership of the interstate railroads is not the same thing as government ownership of all the railroads and that it is not as good. We have shown that the affirmative plan would disrupt our transportation system, that it would complicate our methods of controlling the railroads, that it would divide our transportation system artificially, that such a division is unrecognized in practical business operation and unchampioned by competent authority. We have shown also that their plan is impracticable because it would not give the government complete control over the situation, because it is vague and indefinite in scope and extent, because it would handicap the government by the necessity of adjustments with private enterprise which would rob the government of independence of operation. The affirmative have not disproved these contentions. They have not shown in any way that government ownership of the interstate railroads would be as successful as government ownership of all the railroads. They have

not proved that their plan is superior, they have merely clouded the issue and tried to confuse you by claiming the merits of government ownership for their plan.

We have maintained that government ownership of all the railroads and private ownership with adequate regulation would either one preserve the unity of our transportation system, would avoid the complications of mixed control and operation, and would not make an artificial, theoretical, and unbusinesslike division of our railroads, that they are practicable plans, well known, and advocated as solutions of our transportation problems. Authorities are divided between these two plans but they accept one or the other and pay absolutely no attention to the plan the affirmative are advocating. Where authorities differ, as they do on these two plans, we do not feel called upon to make a choice and we are not required to do so under the terms of the question. We have met the issue of the debate by showing that either of these plans is superior to the affirmative plan. We maintain therefore that as long as there is a better plan the federal government should not own and operate the interstate railroads.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP. OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS

A. AFFIRMATIVE REFERENCES. (SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE)

BOOKS

Carl S. Vrooman. *American Railway Problems.*

E. D. Kenna. *Railway Misrule.*

- Samuel O. Dunn. *The American Transportation Question.*
 — *Government Ownership of Railways.*
 Slasson Thompson. *The Railway Library* for years 1909-14.
 Louis D. Brandeis. *Business, A Profession.*
 Emory R. Johnson. *Elements of Transportation.*
 Edwin A. Pratt. *Railway Nationalization.*
 E. A. Davis. *Nationalization of Railways.*

ARTICLES

- Howard Elliot, President of New Haven R. R.
 Senator O. W. Underwood (Address to R. R. men).
 Logan McPherson, Bureau of Ry. Economics.
 Data from various sources, excerpts from magazines furnished
 by Bureau of Railway Economics.
 Compilation of articles in *Debaters' Handbook* (H. W. Wilson
 Co.).
 Statements by prominent railway officials and officers in U. S.
 Army relative to particular questions.

B. NEGATIVE REFERENCES. (UNIVERSITY OF RED-
LANDS)

BOOKS

- The Railway Guide Book.* (Copy to be found at any station.)

PAMPHLETS

- Bulletins of the California Railroad Commission.
 Bulletins of other state commissions.

LETTERS

- F. H. Dixon, Bureau of Railway Economics.
 Also from various railway attorneys.

DECISIONS

- U. S. Supreme Court Decisions in cases involving the meaning
 and significance of the term "interstate" of which there
 are several, the following being of value:
 Covington Bridge Co. vs. Kentucky 154 U. S. 204. (De-
 fines interstate commerce.)
 Mobile and Ohio R. R. Amer. and Eng. Ency. of Law Vol.

XI, pp. 557. (On state control of traffic over interstate road.)

NOTE.—By the use of maps and the railway guide book with its statistics on mileage the negative were able to make an estimate of the general relations of inter- and intra-state railroads and of their proportionate mileage.

The negative point of view is original with the men and the coach of this debate and had to be worked out without references or material of great value. General reading was done on the railroad question, and railroad men were questioned at every opportunity. The Santa Fé agent at Redlands, Mr. W. R. Flynn, furnished the facts about the Texas railway situation and many other ideas.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

1915-1916 YEAR BOOK OF INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATING

ALABAMA

Alabama Polytechnic Institute. Auburn. Non-sectarian.
(No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—North Carolina Agri. College and University of Georgia. (See North Carolina Agri. College.)

Single Debate—(See Tulane University, La.)

Single Debate—(See North Carolina Agri. College.)

Talladega College. Talladega. Congregational. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—Morehouse and Knoxville. (See Knoxville College, Tenn.)

ARIZONA

Arizona University. Tucson. State. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—(See Texas University.)

Single Debate—(See University of Southern California Law.)

ARKANSAS

Ouachita College. Arkadelphia. Baptist. Coach—W. H. Vaun. Manager 1916—J. T. Fowlkes.

Single Debate—Louisiana College. Two on team. Date—April 28, 1916. Place—Arkadelphia, Ark. Question—Resolved, that a substantial increase in our army and navy would be for the best interests of the United States. Decision—Louisiana Affirmative 0, Ouachita Negative 3.

Single Debate—Simmons College. Two on team. Date—May 12, 1916. Place—Abilene, Texas. Question—Re-

solved, that a substantial increase of our army and navy would be for the best interests of the United States.

Decision — Simmons Affirmative 2, Ouachita Negative 1.

University of Arkansas. Fayetteville. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate — (See University of Texas.)

CALIFORNIA

Leland Stanford University. Palo Alto. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach — Karl E. Leib. Manager 1916 — Karl E. Leib.

Triangular Debate — Universities of Washington and Oregon at Palo Alto and Eugene. Two on teams. Date — March 24, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the United States should increase its navy above third place in fighting efficiency. Decisions — At Palo Alto, Stanford Affirmative 1, Washington Negative 2. At Eugene, Oregon Affirmative 1, Stanford Negative 2. At Seattle (no report).

Single Debate — University of California, Berkeley. Three on teams. Date — Nov. 12, 1915. Place — San Francisco. Question — Resolved, that all railways engaged in interstate commerce, with the exception of interurban electric lines crossing state boundaries, should be owned and operated by the Federal Government. Decision — Stanford Affirmative 2, California Negative 1.

Single Debate — University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Three on team. Date — Nov. 12, 1915. Place — Los Angeles. Question — Resolved, that all railways engaged in interstate commerce, with the exception of interurban electric lines crossing state boundaries, should be owned and operated by the Federal Government. Decision — University of Southern California Affirmative 1, Stanford Negative 2.

Single Carnot Debate — University of California, Berkeley. (Extempore Debate.) Three on teams — two Stanford and one California, and two California and one Stanford composing the teams. Medal awarded to the best debater. Date — April 14, 1916. Place — Berkeley. Question — Resolved, that a system of Compulsory Arbitra-

tion in Industrial Disputes would make for the welfare of the French people. Decision — Carnot Medal awarded to Cohen of California by two judges, one judge voting for Grathwell of Stanford.

Occidental College. Los Angeles. Presbyterian. No coach. Prof. Hubert G. Shearin in charge. Manager 1916 — Clifford Barrett. No report 1916.

Triangular Debate — Pomona College, Claremont, and University of Southern California, Los Angeles. See Pomona College.

Single Debate (Women) — University of Southern California. (No report.)

Single Debate — Southwestern College of Law, Los Angeles. No report.

Single Debate (Women) — See University of Redlands.

Pomona College. Claremont. Congregational. Coach 1915-1916 — Frederick N. Edwards. Manager 1915-1916 — Clarence S. Gillett. Manager 1917 — Raymond Wansley.

Triangular — University of Southern California and Occidental College at Los Angeles. Three on teams. Date — March 2, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the United States should acquire a government owned merchant marine. Decisions — At Los Angeles, Univ. of So. California Affirmative 1, Pomona Negative 2. At Claremont, Pomona Affirmative 2, Occidental Negative 1. At Los Angeles, Univ. of So. California and Occidental. No report.

Dual Debate (Women) — Whittier College, Whittier, Calif. Two on team. Date — April 20, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the State of California should adopt the unicameral legislative system. Decisions — At Claremont, Pomona Affirmative 3, Whittier Negative 0. At Whittier Affirmative 1, Pomona Negative 2.

Single Debate (Women) — Redlands University, Redlands, Calif. Two on team. Date — April 20, 1916. Place — Redlands. Question — Resolved, that the State of California should adopt the unicameral legislative system. Decision — Redlands Affirmative 3, Pomona Negative 0.

Single Debate (Freshmen) — University of So. California,

Los Angeles. Two on team. Date—May 4, 1916. Place—Claremont. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a program of compulsory military training and service. Decision—Univ. of So. California Affirmative 1, Pomona 2.

Single Debate (Freshmen)—Redlands University, Redlands. Two on team. Date—May 4, 1916. Place—Redlands. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a program of compulsory military training and service. Decision—Pomona Affirmative 1, Redlands Negative 2.

Troop College of Technology. Pasadena. Non-sectarian. No coach. Manager 1915-1916—Norman Prosser. No report.

Single Debate—Redlands University, Redlands. No report. (See Redlands University.)

University of California. Berkeley. Non-sectarian. Coach—None. Manager 1916-1917—Josef Carey.

Single Debate—(See Leland Stanford above.)

Single Carnot Debate—(See Leland Stanford above.)

University of Redlands. Redlands. Baptist. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach—Egbert Ray Nichols, English Dept. Manager 1916—Arthur Jacobson. Mgr. 1917—Fred D. Fagg, Jr.

Single Debate—Southwestern College. Winfield, Kans. Two on team. Date—March 30, 1916. Place—Winfield. Question—Resolved, that the United States should own and operate the interstate railroads. Decision—Southwestern Affirmative 3, Redlands Negative 0.

Single Debate—University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex. Two on team. Date—March 27, 1916. Place—Albuquerque. Question—Resolved, that the United States should own and operate the interstate railroads. Decision—New Mexico Affirmative 0, Redlands Negative 3.

Triangular (Freshmen)—Pomona College, Claremont, and University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Two on teams. Date—May 4, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a program of compulsory military training and service. Decisions—At Pomona,

Los Angeles and Redlands, each debate 2 to 1 for the negative.

Single Debate—Throop College of Technology, Pasadena, Calif. Two on teams. Place—Redlands. Date—April 28, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a program of military training and service. Decision—Redlands Negative 3 to 0.

Single Debate (Women)—Pomona College, Claremont, Cal. Two on teams. Place—Redlands. Date—April 20, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the State of California should adopt the unicameral legislative system. Decision—Redlands Affirmative 3 to 0.

Single Debate (Women)—Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal. Two on teams. Place—Los Angeles. Date—April 20, 1916. Question—Resolved that the State of California should adopt the unicameral legislative system. Decision—Occidental Affirmative 3 to 0.

University of Southern California. Los Angeles. Methodist. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach—Jay L. Chestnut. Manager 1915-1916—Emory E. Olson. Mgr. 1917—Alvin Wendt. Triangular—Pomona and Occidental colleges. See Pomona above.

Triangular (Freshmen)—University of Redlands and Pomona Freshmen. See University of Redlands above.

Single Debate—University of Texas. See Texas.

Single Debate (Women)—Occidental College (?) No report.

University of Southern California Law School. Los Angeles. Methodist. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach—H. N. Wells. Manager 1916-1917—H. N. Wells.

Dual Debate—Whittier College. Whittier, Calif. (Law School Freshmen.) Two on team. Date—Feb. 14, 1916. Question—Resolved, that tariff duties should be imposed by a Federal Tariff Commission, and not by Congress. Decisions—At Whittier, Whittier Affirmative 1; U. S. C. Law Negative 2. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. Law Affirmative 3, Whittier Negative 0.

Single Debate—University of Arizona. Tucson, Ariz. Two on team. Date—March 14, 1916. Place—Los Angeles.

Question—Resolved, that the increase in military and naval forces, recommended by the President in his message of December 7th, 1915, provides adequately for the military and naval needs of the United States. Decision—University of Arizona Affirmative 2, U. S. C. Law Negative 1.

Single Debate—University of Montana. Missoula, Mont. Two on team. Date—April 7, 1916. Place—Los Angeles. Question—Resolved, that the Initiative and Referendum should be made a part of the legislative systems of State governments. Decision—University of Montana Affirmative 2, U. S. C. Law Negative 1.

Single Debate—Denver University, Denver, Colo. Two on team. Date—April 7, 1916. Place—Denver. Question—Resolved, that a literacy test should be imposed on all European Immigration. Decision—Denver University Affirmative 0, U. S. C. Law Negative 3.

Single Debate—Columbia University. New York City. Three on team. Date—April 14, 1916. Place—Los Angeles. Question—Resolved, that the United States should immediately and materially increase the army and navy. Decision—U. S. C. Law Affirmative 3, Columbia University Negative 0.

Single Debate—University of New Mexico. Albuquerque, N. Mex. Two on team. Date—April 25, 1916. Place—Albuquerque. Question—Resolved, that the Interstate Trade Commission should be empowered to regulate trusts and monopolies as the Interstate Commerce Commission is empowered to regulate railways. Decision—University of New Mexico Affirmative 2, U. S. C. Law Negative 1.

Whittier College. Whittier, Calif. Friends. Dr. H. T. Allen, English Dept., in charge. Manager 1915-1916—Harry C. Reid. No report 1916.

Single Debate—University Southern California Law Freshmen. See University of Southern California Law.

Dual Debate—Pomona College. See Pomona.

COLORADO

Colorado Agricultural College. Fort Collins, Colo. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach—Alfred Westfall. Debate manager 1916—none.

Triangular Debate—University of Denver, Denver, and University of Wyoming, Laramie. Two on teams. Date—March 31, 1916. Question—Resolved, that immigration to the United States should be further restricted by the literacy test embodied in bill 6060 of the third session of the 63rd Congress. Decisions—At Fort Collins, Colorado Agri. College Affirmative 2, University of Wyoming Negative 1. At Denver, Denver University Affirmative 2, Colorado Agri. College Negative 1. At Laramie, Wyoming, University of Wyoming Affirmative 1, Denver University Negative 2.

Colorado College. Colorado Springs. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach—Solomon Blum and Prof. Molten. Manager 1916—F. F. McCammon. Manager 1917—Demer Vickers.

Single Debate—William Jewell College. Liberty, Missouri. Three on team. Date—March 10, 1916. Place—Colorado Springs. Question—Resolved, that immigration should be further restricted by a literacy test. Decision—William Jewell Affirmative 1, Colorado College Negative 2.

Single Debate—Denver University. Denver. Three on team. Date—April 14, 1916. Place—Denver. Question—Resolved, that immigration should be further restricted by a literacy test. Decision—Denver University Affirmative 2, Colorado College Negative 1.

University of Colorado. Boulder. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1916.

Triangular—Texas University and Missouri University. See Texas University.

Triangular—Kansas University and Oklahoma University. See Kansas University.

University of Denver. Denver, Colo. Methodist Episcopal.

Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach—Mrs. P. S. Kingsley. Manager 1916—T. W. Allsworth.

Triangular Debate—Colorado Agricultural College and University of Wyoming. See Colorado Agricultural College above.

Single Debate—University of Southern California Law. (See University of Southern California Law.)

Single Debate—Colorado College. (See Colorado College.)

CONNECTICUT

Trinity College. Hartford, Conn. Non-sectarian. Coach—Gustavus Adolphus Klene. Manager 1915-1916—R. Z. Johnston.

Triangular Debate—Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., and New York University, N. Y. City. Three on teams. Date—April 13, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a policy of government ownership and management of the telephone and telegraph systems. Decisions—At Hartford, Trinity Affirmative 0, Rutgers Negative 3. At New York City, New York University Affirmative 1, Trinity Negative 2. At New Brunswick, N. J., Rutgers Affirmative 1, New York University Negative 2.

Wesleyan University. Middletown. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1916.

Triangular Debate—Bowdoin College, Maine, and Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. (See Bowdoin College.)

Yale University. New Haven. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Prof. J. C. Adams, faculty member in charge. Manager 1915-1916—Raymond Dudley. No report 1916.

Triangular Debate—Harvard and Princeton Universities. (See Harvard.)

Dual Debate—Syracuse University. (See Syracuse University.)

Triangular Debate (Freshmen)—Harvard and Princeton Universities. (See Princeton.)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Georgetown University. Washington. Catholic. No report 1916.

George Washington University. Washington. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1916.

Howard University. Washington. Non-sectarian. Coach—Prof. Montgomery Gregory. Manager 1915-1916—J. W. Love. No report 1916.

FLORIDA

University of Florida. Gainesville. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—(See Tulane University, La.)

GEORGIA

Atlanta University. Atlanta. Non-sectarian. Coach—Prof. George A. Towns. Manager 1915-1916—Asa H. Gordon. No report 1916.

Emory College. Oxford, Ga. Methodist Episcopal South. Sec. of Debate Council 1915-1916—G. C. White. 1916-1917—J. G. Stipe.

Single Debate—Davidson College, Davidson, N. C. Two on team. Date—April 17, 1916. Place—Decatur, Georgia. Question—Resolved, that the English form of government is more democratic than that of the United States. Decision—Davidson Affirmative 4, Emory Negative 1.

Mercer University. Macon. Baptist. No report 1916.

Morehouse College. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—(See Knoxville College, Tenn.)

University of Georgia. Athens. Non-sectarian. No coach. E. B. Dunlap, Chairman of Debate Council. No report 1916.

Triangular Debate—Alabama Poly. and North Carolina Agri. College. (See North Carolina Agri. College.)

Triangular Debate—Universities of Tennessee and South Carolina. (See University of Tenn.)

IDAHO

University of Idaho. Moscow. Non-sectarian. No report 1916.

Dual Debate—(See Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington.)

Dual Debate — (See Utah Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.)
 Single Debate — (See Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.)

ILLINOIS

Augustana College. Rock Island. Lutheran. Coach — Att'y J. Clinton Learle. Manager 1916 — Clarence Grandlund.

Triangular Debate — Illinois College, Jacksonville, and Monmouth College, Monmouth. Three on teams. Date — March 31, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine, as developed and applied by the United States, should be abandoned as a part of our foreign policy. Decisions — At Rock Island, Augustana College Affirmative 1, Illinois College Negative 2. At Monmouth, Monmouth College Affirmative 2, Augustana College 1. At Jacksonville, Illinois College Affirmative 0, Monmouth Negative 3.

Single Debate — Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill. (Limited to Freshmen and Sophomores.) Three on team. Date — April 14, 1916. Place — Rock Island, Ill. Question — Resolved, that immigration to the United States should be further restricted by a literacy test. Decision — Bradley Polytechnic Institute Affirmative 0, Augustana College Negative 3.

Carthage College. Carthage. Lutheran. Coach — Prof. Carl W. Spielman. Manager 1915-1916 — T. B. Uber. Manager 1916-1917 — C. W. Spielman.

Triangular Debate — Hedding College, Abingdon, Ill., and William and Vashti College, Aledo, Ill. Three on teams. Date — March 17, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the military preparedness of the United States should be strengthened. Decisions — At Carthage, Carthage Affirmative 1, Hedding Negative 2. At Abingdon, Hedding Affirmative 1, William and Vashti Negative 2. At Aledo, William and Vashti Affirmative 2, Carthage 1.

Eureka College. Eureka. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. President H. O. Pritchard in charge. No report 1916.

Hedding College. Abingdon Methodist Episcopal. Coach — J. H. Toelle. Manager 1915-1916 — Glenn Hickie.

- Triangular Debate—Carthage College, Carthage, and William and Vashti College, Aledo. (See Carthage College above.)
- Illinois College.** Jacksonville, Ill. Presbyterian. Coach—Prof. J. Y. Ames. Manager 1915-1916—J. C. Irwin. Manager 1916-1917—C. R. Apple.
- Triangular Debate—Augustana College, Rock Island, and Monmouth College, Monmouth. (See Augustana College above.)
- Illinois Normal.** Normal. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)
- Triangular Debate—Indiana State Normal and Oshkosh Normal. (See State Normal School, Oshkosh, Wisconsin.)
- Illinois Wesleyan.** Bloomington. Methodist Episcopal. Pi Kappa Delta. P. C. Somerville, Coach and Manager. No report 1916.
- James Milliken University.** Decatur. Presbyterian. Coach—H. G. Seldomridge. No report 1916.
- Knox College.** Galesburg. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Dwight E. Watkins, Prof. of Public Speaking, in charge. No report 1916.
- Monmouth College.** Monmouth. United Presbyterian. Coach—Arthur Andrews.
- Triangular Debate—Augustana College and Illinois College. (See Augustana College above.)
- Northwestern College.** Naperville. Evangelical. Phi Alpha Tau. Coach—Prof. E. W. Himmel. Manager 1915-1916—Harry Oberhelman. Manager 1916-1917—Marlo Berger.
- Triangular Debate—Ripon College, Ripon, Wis., and Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis. Three on teams. Date—April 29, 1916. Question—Resolved, that foreign immigration to the United States should be restricted by the imposition of an educational test. Decisions—At Naperville, Northwestern Affirmative 3, Ripon Negative 0. At Waukesha, Carroll College Affirmative 1, Northwestern Negative 2. At Ripon, Ripon College Affirmative 3, Carroll College Negative 0.
- Northwestern University.** Evanston. Methodist Episcopal. Delta Sigma Rho. James L. Lardner, Coach and Man-

ager. Clarion D. Hardy, assistant. No report 1916.
Triangular Debate—Chicago and Michigan Universities.
(See Chicago University.)

Single Debate (Freshmen)—(See Chicago just below.)

Single Debate—Iowa University. (See Iowa University.)

University of Chicago. Chicago. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach—H. G. Moulton.

Triangular Debate—Northwestern University, Evanston, and Michigan University, Ann Arbor. Three on teams. Date—Jan. 21, 1916. Question—Resolved, that Congress should adopt a literacy test for all European Immigration. Decisions—At Chicago, Chicago Affirmative 2, Michigan Negative 1. At Evanston, Northwestern Affirmative 1, Chicago Negative 2. At Ann Arbor, Northwestern Negative 1, Michigan Affirmative 2.

Single Debate—Colorado University. Boulder, Colo. Two on team. Date—April 13, 1916. Place—Chicago. Question—Resolved, that Congress should adopt a literacy test for all European Immigration. Decision—Chicago Affirmative 0, Colorado Negative 3.

Single Debate (Freshmen)—Northwestern, Evanston. Three on team. Decision—Northwestern Affirmative 1, Chicago Negative 2.

University of Illinois. Urbana. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. L. R. Sarett, Coach and Manager.

Triangular Debate—Universities of Iowa and Minnesota. Three on team. Date—Dec. 10, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a system of compulsory industrial insurance. (Constitutionality waived.) Decisions—At Urbana, Ill., University of Ill. Affirmative 2, University of Iowa Negative 1. At Urbana, University of Minnesota Affirmative 3, University of Illinois Negative 0. At Iowa City, University of Iowa Affirmative 3, University of Minnesota Negative 0.

Triangular—University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and University of Wisconsin, Madison. Three on teams. Date—March, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should own and operate all public service telephone and telegraph lines. (Constitutionality waived.)

Decisions — At Urbana, University of Illinois Affirmative 0, University of Michigan Negative 3. At Madison, Wis., University of Wisconsin Affirmative 1, University of Illinois Negative 2. At Ann Arbor, Wisconsin and Michigan, Michigan Affirmative 3 to 0.

William and Vashti College. Aledo. Non-sectarian. Coach — Leila M. Swarts. (Head of English Dep't.) Manager 1916 — R. C. Kenney.

Triangular — Carthage College, Carthage, Ill., and Hedding College, Abingdon, Ill. (See Carthage College above.)

INDIANA

Butler College. Indianapolis. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. H. B. Stout, Coach. Address — Lemcke Bldg., Indianapolis. No report 1916.

DePauw University. Greencastle. Methodist Episcopal. Tau Kappa Alpha. Prof. H. B. Gough in charge. Edward Troxel, Assistant. No report 1916.

Earlham College. Richmond. Friends. E. P. Trueblood, Coach and Manager.

Single Debate — Albion College, Albion, Mich. Three on team. Date — March 18, 1916. Place — Albion. Question — Resolved, that the City of Chicago should exempt all personal property and improvements from taxation. Decision — Albion Affirmative 1, Earlham Negative 2.

Single Debates (Four) — Indiana University and (One) DePauw University. Two on teams. Held at towns away from any of the Colleges. Questions — County Commission form of Government for Indiana, and Referendum for Indiana. No judges. Decisions left to the audience and given according to the merits of the question, not necessarily according to the strength of debate.

Single Debate — Heidelberg. (See Heidelberg University, Ohio.)

Indiana University. Bloomington. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach — Ralph Richman. No report 1916.

Single Debate — Earlham College. (See Earlham College.)

Indiana State Normal. Terre Haute. Non-sectarian. Coach — C. Baldwin Bacon. No report 1916.

Triangular Debate—Illinois Normal and Oshkosh, Wis. Normal. (See Oshkosh.)

Notre Dame University. Notre Dame. R. Catholic. W. A. Bogler, Coach and Manager. (No report 1916.)

Wabash College. Crawfordsville. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. No report 1916.

IOWA

Buena Vista. Storm Lake. Coach—W. I. Easley. (No report 1916.)

Central College. Pella. Baptist. Pi Kappa Delta. Prof. J. D. Dodson in charge. (No report 1916.)

Coe College. Cedar Rapids. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, and Grinnell College, Grinnell. (See Cornell College just below.)

Dual Debate (Women)—Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls. (See Iowa State Teachers College.)

Triangular Debate—Hamline and Macalester. (See Macalester College, Minn.)

Cornell College. Mt. Vernon. Methodist Episcopal. Coach—Prof. A. S. Keister. Manager 1915-1916—Don C. Kreger. Manager 1916-1917—K. C. Smith.

Triangular Debate—Coe College, Cedar Rapids, and Grinnell College, Grinnell. Three on teams. Date—March 10, 1916. Question—Resolved, that minimum wage laws should be applied to factories, workshops and department stores in the several states. Decisions—At Mount Vernon, Cornell Affirmative 1, Coe Negative 2. At Grinnell, Grinnell Affirmative 2, Cornell Negative 1. At Cedar Rapids, Coe and Grinnell. (No report.)

Single Debate—Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis. Three on team. Date—April 7, 1916. Place—Appleton, Wis. Question—Resolved, that minimum wage laws should be applied to factories, workshops and department stores in the several states. Decision—Lawrence Affirmative 3, Cornell Negative 0.

Des Moines College. Des Moines. Baptist. Mrs. F. T. Stephenson, Eng. Dept., in charge. Manager 1916—Albert Jensen. (No report.)

Drake University. Des Moines. Non-sectarian. Frank E. Brown, Prof. of Public Speaking, in charge. (No report 1916.)

Ellsworth College. Iowa Falls. (No report.)

Grinnell College. Grinnell. Non-sectarian. Coach—Earl Strong.

Triangular Debate—(No report, see Cornell College, Mt. Vernon.)

Quadrangular Debate, with Carleton, Beloit, and Knox Colleges. (Plan abandoned.)

Highland Park College. Des Moines. Presbyterian. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach—Robert H. Atchison. Manager 1916-1917—R. H. Atchison.

Dual Debate—Iowa State Teachers' College, Cedar Falls. Three on team. Date—Dec. 3, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should retain permanent possession of the Philippine Islands. Decisions—At Highland Park, Negative won, 2-1. At Iowa State, Negative won, 2-1.

Iowa State College. Ames. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach—Harry Burtis. Manager 1916—C. C. Min-
teer.

Triangular Debate—Kansas Agri. College, Manhattan, and University of South Dakota, Vermillion. Three on teams. Date—Nov. 19, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the Federal Government should own and operate the telephone and telegraph systems as a part of the postal service. Decisions—At Ames, Iowa State Affirmative 1, University of South Dakota Negative 2. At Manhattan, Kansas Agri. College Affirmative 1, Iowa State Negative 2. At Vermillion, University of South Dakota Affirmative 3, Kansas Agri. College Negative 0.

Triangular Debate—Michigan Agricultural College, Lansing, Mich., and Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind. Three on teams. Date—March 17, 1916. Question—Resolved, that there should be vested in the Federal Government the exclusive right to manufacture and sell arms and munitions of war. Decisions—Ames, Ia., Iowa State Affirmative 3, Purdue University Negative 0. At La-

fayette, Ind., Purdue Affirmative 2, Michigan Agri. College Negative 1. At East Lansing, Mich., Michigan Agri. College Affirmative 1, Iowa State Negative 2.

Triangular Debate—Colleges of Agriculture of Minnesota and Wisconsin Universities. Three on teams. Date—May 12, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the best interests of the farmers of the United States require a protective tariff. Decisions—At Ames, Ia., Iowa State Affirmative 2, Wisconsin Negative 1. At Madison, Wis., Wisconsin Affirmative 0, Minnesota Negative 3. At Minneapolis, Minn., Minnesota Affirmative 2, Iowa State Negative 1.

Iowa State Teachers College. Cedar Falls. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. John Barnes, Coach and Manager. **Dual Debate**—Highland Park College, Des Moines, Ia. (See Highland Park College above.)

Dual Debate—Simpson College, Indianola, Ia. Three on team. Date—March 18, 1916. Place—Cedar Falls and Indianola. Question—Resolved, that the Sherman Anti-trust Law as modified by the Clayton Law and the Trade Commission Act is inadequate to regulate the trusts. Decisions—Iowa State Teachers' College 6 votes.

Dual Debate (Women)—Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia. Three on team. Date—May 19, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should take immediate steps to make her navy equal to any in the world. Decisions—At Cedar Falls, Iowa, S. T. Coll. Affirmative 1, Coe College Negative 2. At Cedar Rapids, Coe College Affirmative 0, Iowa S. T. College Negative 3.

Iowa Wesleyan. Mt. Pleasant, Iowa. Methodist Episcopal. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach—Prof. R. Luebers. Manager—J. H. Kemble.

Single Debate—Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Ia. Three on team. Date—May 12, 1916. Place—Fayette. Question—Resolved, that the Single Tax would be a desirable form of taxation for state and local governments.

Leander Clark College. Toledo. United Brethren. No report 1916.

Luther College. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate — (See Gustavus Adolphus, Minn.)

Morningside College. Sioux City. Methodist. Coach and Manager — Prof. Chas. A. Marsh.

Triangular Debate — Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, S. Dak., and St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn. Three on teams. Date — March 17, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the City Manager Plan of Government should be adopted by municipalities in the United States. Decisions — At Sioux City, Morningside Affirmative 3, Dakota Wesleyan Negative 0. At Northfield, St. Olaf Affirmative 1, Morningside 2. At Mitchell, S. Dak., Dakota Wesleyan 2, St. Olaf 1.

Triangular Debate (Women) — University of South Dakota and Huron College. Three on teams. Date — Feb. 29, 1916. Question — Resolved, that immigration into the United States should be further restricted by a literacy test. Decisions — At Huron, Huron College Affirmative 1, Morningside Negative 2. At Sioux City, Morningside Affirmative 2, University of South Dakota Negative 1. At Vermillion, S. Dak., University of South Dakota Affirmative 0, Huron College 3.

Parsons College. Fairfield. Presbyterian. Coach and Manager for 1916 — A. R. Morris.

Dual Debate — Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia. Two on teams. Date — Feb. 18, 1916. Question — Resolved, that a single tax on land values is a desirable form of taxation for state and local governments. (Constitutionality granted.) Decisions — At Oskaloosa, Parsons Affirmative and Penn Negative. (No decision.) At Fairfield, Penn Affirmative 1, Parsons Negative 2.

Penn College. Oskaloosa. Friends. Coach and Manager 1916 — W. C. Dennis.

Dual Debate — Parsons College, Fairfield, Ia. (See Parsons College just above.)

Triangular Debate — Parsons and Des Moines College. (Des Moines withdrew, making it impossible to have these debates.)

Simpson College. Indianola. Methodist Episcopal. Coach — Levi P. Goodwin. Manager 1916 — Raymond Sayre.

Dual Debate — Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Ia.
(See Iowa State Teachers College above.)

University of Iowa. Iowa City. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach — Leonard H. Racker. Manager 1916-1917 — Prof. Glenn N. Merry.

Triangular Debate — Universities of Illinois and Minnesota.
(See University of Illinois.)

Single Debate — Northwestern University, Evanston. Two on team. Date — April 28, 1916. Place — Evanston, Ill. Question — Resolved, that the Philippine Islands should be given their independence within the next four years. Decision — Iowa Affirmative 2, Northwestern Negative 1.

Upper Iowa University. Fayette. Methodist Episcopal. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — (See Iowa Wesleyan above.)

KANSAS

Baker University. Baldwin. Methodist Episcopal. Coach — Alfred E. Leach. Manager 1916 — Melvin Rigg.

Pentangular Debate — Washburn College, Topeka, Kans.; Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.; Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kans.; College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans. Three on teams. Question — Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine as developed and applied should be abandoned as a part of our foreign policy. Decisions. — First series, March 24, 1916. At Manhattan, Kansas Agri. College Affirmative 0, Ottawa Negative 3. At Baldwin, Baker University Affirmative 2, Kansas Agri. College Negative 1. At Emporia, College of Emporia Affirmative 0, Baker University Negative 3. At Ottawa, Ottawa Affirmative 0, Washburn Negative 3. At Topeka, Washburn Affirmative 2, Emporia Negative 1. Second Series, April 14, 1916. At Manhattan, College of Emporia Affirmative 0, Kans. S. Agri. College Negative 3. At Baldwin, Washburn Affirmative 2, Baker Negative 1. At Emporia, Ottawa Affirmative 0, College of Emporia 3. At Ottawa, Baker Affirmative 2, Ottawa Negative 1. At Topeka, Kansas S. Agri. College Affirmative 0, Washburn Negative 3.

Bethany College. Lindsborg. Lutheran. No report 1916.

Bethel College. Newton. Coach—Prof. E. E. Leisy. Manager 1916—Irvin Haury. Manager 1917—Prof. A. B. Schmidt.

Triangular Debate—Friends University, Wichita, and Cooper College, Sterling. Three on teams. Date—March 21, 1916. Question—Resolved, that Kansas should adopt a unicameral form of legislature. Decisions—At Newton, Bethel College Affirmative 3, Friends University Negative 0. At Sterling, Cooper College Affirmative 0, Bethel College Negative 3. At Wichita, Friends University and Cooper College. (No report.)

Single Debate—Southwestern College Academy, Winfield. Three on team. Date—April 28, 1916. Place—Newton, Kans. Question—Resolved, that a national minimum wage scale should be adopted in the United States. (Constitutionality waived.) Decision—Bethel College Academy Affirmative 2, Southwestern College Academy Negative 1.

Single Debate—McPherson Academy, McPherson, Kans. Two on team. Date—April 16, 1916. Place—McPherson. Question—Resolved, that the United States should enact legislation embodying the Principle of the German Industrial Insurance Law, for the Compensation of Industrial Accidents in this country, Constitutionality waived. Decision—McPherson Academy Affirmative 0, Bethel Academy Negative 3.

College of Emporia. Emporia. Presbyterian. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate (Women)—Fairmount College, Wichita, and Ottawa University, Ottawa. (See Fairmount College below.)

Pentangular Debate—Baker University, Kansas S. Agri. College, Ottawa University and Washburn College. (See Baker University above.)

Cooper College. Sterling. United Presbyterian. Coach—S. A. Wilson. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—Bethel College and Friends University. (See Bethel College above.)

Fairmount College. Wichita. Congregational. Coach — C. C. Harbison. Manager 1916-1917 — Linn Beebe. Pi Kappa Delta.

Dual Debate — Friends University, Wichita. Two on teams. Date — April 26, 1916. Place — Wichita. Question — Resolved, that in anti-trust legislation labor unions should not be construed as combinations in restraint of trade. Decisions — 3-0 for Fairmount in both debates.

Triangular Debate (Women) — College of Emporia, Emporia, and Ottawa University, Ottawa. Date — April 10, 1916. Question — Resolved, that a minimum wage for women should be established by the various states. Decisions — At Fairmount, Fairmount Affirmative 3, College of Emporia Negative 0. At Ottawa, Ottawa University Affirmative 2, Fairmount College Negative 1. At Emporia, College of Emporia Affirmative 0, Ottawa Negative 3.

Friends University. Wichita. Friends. Coach — Prof. W. J. Reagan. Manager 1916 — N. Hall. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Bethel College, Newton, and Cooper College, Sterling. (See Bethel College above.)

Dual Debate — (See Fairmount College above.)

Kansas State Agriculture College. Manhattan. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach and Manager — John R. Macarthur.

Triangular Debate — Iowa State College and University of South Dakota. (See Iowa State College.)

Dual Debate (Women) — Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina. Three on team. Date — Dec. 10, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should make an increase in her armament. Decisions — At Manhattan, Kansas S. Agri. College Affirmative 2, Kansas Wesleyan Negative 1. At Salina, Kansas Wesleyan Affirmative 3, Kansas S. Agri. College Negative 0.

Dual Debate — Kansas State Normal, Emporia. Three on team. Date — Jan. 28, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the United States should insist that the Open Door Policy, as laid down by John Hay, be strictly respected by all nations. Decisions — At Manhattan, Kansas State

Normal, Negative, got the decision. At Emporia, Kansas S. Agri. College, Negative, got the decision. (One judge for this debate.)

Dual Debate (Women) — Washburn College, Topeka. Three on team. Date — March 3, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine, as developed and applied, should be abandoned as a part of our foreign policy. Decisions — At Manhattan, Kansas S. Agri. College Affirmative 0, Washburn Negative 3. At Washburn, Washburn College Affirmative 3, Kansas S. Agri. College Negative 0.

Dual Debate (Women) — Missouri State Normal, Warrensburg. Three on team. April 28, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the United States Government should establish a literacy test for the admission of all European immigrants. Decisions — At Manhattan, Kansas S. Agri. College Affirmative, got the decision. At Warrensburg, Mo., Missouri Normal, Affirmative, got the decision. (One judge.)

Pentangular Debate — Baker University, Baldwin; College of Emporia, Emporia; Ottawa University, Ottawa; Washburn College, Topeka. (See Baker University.)

Kansas State Normal. Emporia. Non-sectarian. Coach and Manager — F. L. Gilson. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — (See Kansas S. Agri. College just above.)

Kansas Wesleyan University. Salina. Methodist. Coach — L. C. Huffman. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — Southwestern College, Winfield. (See Southwestern College.)

Dual Debate (Women) — (See Kansas S. Agri. College.)

Single Debate — (See Wm. Jewell College, Mo.)

McPherson College. McPherson. Coach — Dr. A. J. Culler. Manager 1917 — John Hoerner.

Single Debate — McPherson Academy and Bethel Academy. (See Bethel College.)

Ottawa University. Ottawa. Baptist. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach — R. H. Ritchie and C. O. Hardy. Manager 1917 — R. H. Ritchie.

Pentangular Debate — Baker University, College of Emporia,

Kansas S. Agri. College, and Washburn College. (See Baker University.)

Triangular Debate (Women) — Fairmount College and College of Emporia. (See Fairmount College.)

Southwestern College. Winfield. Methodist. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach — Prof. A. J. McCulloch. Howard White, Secy. Debate Council.

Single Debate — University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif. (See University of Redlands.)

Dual Debate — Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina. Two on team. Date — April 11, 1916. Question — Resolved, that in anti-trust legislation, labor unions should be exempt from construction as "combinations in restraint of trade." Decisions — At Winfield, Southwestern Affirmative 1, Kansas Wesleyan Negative 2. At Salina, Kansas Wesleyan Affirmative 1, Southwestern Negative 2.

Dual Debate — Oklahoma Agri. and Mech. College, Stillwater. Two on teams. Date — April 15, 1916. Question — Resolved, that in anti-trust legislation, labor unions should be exempt from construction as "combinations in restraint of trade." Decisions — At Stillwater, Southwestern Affirmative 1, Oklahoma A. & M. 2. At Winfield, Oklahoma A. & M. 1, Southwestern 2.

University of Kansas. Lawrence. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Phi Alpha Tau. Coach — Howard T. Hill. Manager 1916 — Harold F. Mattoon.

Dual Debate — Nebraska University, Lincoln. Three on team. Date — Dec. 10, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should immediately and substantially increase her armament. Decisions — At Lawrence, Kansas Affirmative 1, Nebraska Negative 2. At Lincoln, Nebraska Affirmative 2, Kansas Negative 1.

Triangular Debate — Colorado University, Boulder, and Oklahoma University, Norman. Three on teams. Date — March 10, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the United States should permanently retain the Philippine Islands. Decisions — At Lawrence, Kansas Affirmative 2, Colorado Negative 0. At Norman, Okla., Oklahoma Affirmative 3, Kansas Negative 0. At Boulder, Colo., Colorado

and Oklahoma. (No report.) (Two judges only for debate at Lawrence.)

Single Debate—Missouri University, Columbia, Mo. Three on team. Date—April 7, 1916. Place—Lawrence, Kans. Question—Resolved, that Inter-collegiate Athletics should be abolished by American Universities. Decision—Missouri Affirmative 1, Kansas Negative 2.

Washburn College. Topeka. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach—E. D. Schonberger. Coach acts as manager.

Pentangular Debate—Ottawa, Baker, College of Emporia and Kansas S. Agri. College. (See Baker University.)

Dual Debate (Women)—Kansas S. Agri. College. (See Kansas S. A. Coll.)

LOUISIANA

Louisiana State University. Baton Rouge. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach and Manager—Prof. J. Q. Adams.

Triangular Debate—Baylor University and Southern Methodist University. Two on teams. Date—April 10, 1916. Question—Resolved, that a substantial increase in our military and naval establishments would be conducive to peace. Decisions—At Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Affirmative 0, Baylor University Negative 3. At Dallas, Texas, Southern Methodist University Affirmative 1, Louisiana State University Negative 2. At Waco, Texas, Southern Methodist and Baylor University. (No report.)

Tulane University. New Orleans. Non-sectarian. Coach—Dr. James Ruth. Manager 1916—Sumter Cousin.

Single Debate—Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala. Two on team. Date—April 19, 1916. Place—New Orleans. Question—Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine should be abandoned as a permanent part of the foreign policy of the United States. Decision—Alabama Poly. Inst. Affirmative 0, Tulane Negative 3.

Single Debate—University of Florida, Gainesville. Two on team. Date—April 22, 1916. Place—Gainesville, Fla.

Question—Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine should be abandoned as a permanent part of the foreign policy of the United States. Decision—Tulane Affirmative 0, Florida Negative 3.

MAINE

Bates College. Lewiston. Non-sectarian. S. R. Oldham, Coach. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—Clark College and Tufts University. (See Clark College, Mass.)

Bowdoin College. Brunswick. Non-sectarian. Coach—Prof. William Hawley Davis. Manager 1916—Hugh M. Hescok.

Triangular Debate—Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., and Wesleyan College, Middletown, Conn. Three on teams. Date—March 23, 1916. Question—Resolved, that Ex-Secretary Garrison's plan for military reorganization should be adopted. Decisions—At Brunswick, Wesleyan Affirmative 0, Bowdoin Negative 3. At Clinton, Bowdoin Affirmative 1, Hamilton Negative 2. At Middletown, Hamilton Affirmative 3, Wesleyan Negative 0.

MARYLAND

Johns Hopkins University. Baltimore. Non-sectarian. Coach—Prof. John C. French. Manager 1916—A. A. Steinbach.

Triangular Debate—University of Virginia, Charlottesville, and University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Two on teams. Date—April 29, 1916. Question—Resolved, that our Federal Government should compel every able-bodied citizen between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four to take under adequate provisions one year of military or naval training. Decisions—At Baltimore, North Carolina Affirmative 5, Virginia Negative 0. At Charlottesville, Johns Hopkins Affirmative 5, North Carolina Negative 0. At Chapel Hill, Virginia Affirmative 2, Johns Hopkins Negative 3.

MASSACHUSETTS

Clark College. Worcester. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach—L. D. White. Manager 1916-1917—C. L. Reopell.

Triangular Debate—Bates College, Lewiston, Me., and Tufts College, Medford, Mass. Three on teams. Date—March 17, 1916. Question—Resolved, that immigration to the United States should be further restricted by a literacy test. Decisions—At Worcester, Clark Affirmative 2, Tufts Negative 1. At Lewiston, Bates Affirmative 1, Clark Negative 2. At Medford, Tufts Affirmative 0, Bates Negative 3.

Harvard University. Cambridge. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach—A. A. Berle, Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge. Manager 1916—M. M. Roth.

Triangular Debate—Yale and Princeton Universities. Three on teams. Date—March 24, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a system of compulsory military service modeled after that of Switzerland. Decisions—At Cambridge, Princeton Affirmative 3, Harvard Negative 0. At New Haven, Harvard Affirmative 3, Yale Negative 0. At Princeton, Yale Affirmative 0, Princeton Negative 3.

Triangular Debate (Freshmen)—Yale and Princeton. (See Princeton.)

Tufts College. Medford. Non-sectarian. Manager—A. Segel.

Triangular Debate—Bates and Clark. (See Clark College above.)

Williams College. Williamstown. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—Brown and Dartmouth. (See Brown University.)

MICHIGAN

Albion College. Albion. Methodist Episcopal. Delta Sigma Rho. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—Earlham College. (See Earlham College under Indiana.)

Single Debate—Hillsdale College. (See Hillsdale College, Mich.)

Single Debate (Women)—(See Michigan State Normal College below.)

Alma College. Alma. Presbyterian. Coach—Prof. O. W. Hedges. Manager 1916—Errol Stafford. Manager 1917—Myrddyn Davies.

Triangular Debate—Hope College and Olivet College. Three on teams. Date—April 21, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States Government in co-operation with the states should require every able-bodied male citizen upon attaining the age twenty-one years to serve a stipulated term in the state militia. Decisions—At Holland, Mich., Hope College Affirmative 1, Alma Negative 2. At Alma, Alma College Affirmative 1, Olivet College Negative 2. At Olivet, Olivet College Affirmative 2, Hope College Negative 1.

Ferris Institute. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate—(See Michigan State Normal College.)

Hillsdale College. Hillsdale. Non-sectarian. Coach—Gordon L. Cave. Manager 1916—Gordon L. Cave. Manager 1917—Carleton B. Miller.

Dual Debate—Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti. Three on team. Date—Dec. 10, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the boycott should be legalized. Decisions—At Hillsdale, Hillsdale Affirmative 1, Michigan S. Normal College Negative 2. At Ypsilanti, Michigan S. Normal College Affirmative 1, Hillsdale Negative 2.

Single Debate—Albion College, Albion. Three on team. Date—March 10, 1916. Place—Hillsdale. Question—Resolved, that the administration plan of preparedness should be adopted. Decision—Hillsdale Affirmative 1, Albion Negative 2.

Triangular Debate—Hope College, Holland, and Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo. Three on teams. Date—March 17, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt the literacy test as a further restriction to

- European immigration. Decisions—At Hillsdale, Hillsdale Affirmative 0, Kalamazoo Negative 3. At Holland, Hope College Affirmative 3, Hillsdale Negative 0. At Kalamazoo, Affirmative 2, Hope College Negative 1.
- Hope College.** Holland. Reform of America. Manager—T. E. Elferdink and H. Maassen. Phi Beta Sigma.
- Triangular Debate—Alma and Olivet. (See Alma College above.)
- Triangular Debate—Hillsdale and Kalamazoo. (See Hillsdale College just above.)
- Kalamazoo College.** Kalamazoo. Baptist. Coach—Prof. J. Fath. Manager 1916—Wm. E. Shane. Manager 1917—Wm. P. Woodard.
- Triangular Debate—Hope and Hillsdale. (See Hillsdale above.)
- Michigan Agricultural College.** East Lansing. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)
- Triangular Debate—Iowa State College and Purdue University. (See Iowa State College.)
- Michigan State Normal College.** Ypsilanti. Non-sectarian. Coach—Frederick B. McKay. Manager 1916—Philip D. Boyce.
- Dual Debate—Hillsdale College. (See Hillsdale just above.)
- Single Debate (Women)—Albion College, Albion. Three on team. Date—Jan. 14, 1916. Place—Albion, Mich. Question—Resolved, that a minimum wage for women in industry should be adopted. Decision—Michigan S. Normal College Affirmative 0, Albion College Negative 3.
- Dual Debate—Ferris Institute, Big Rapids, Mich. Three on teams. Date—Feb. 18, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt the plan of the administration regarding national defense. Decisions—At Big Rapids, Ferris Institute Affirmative 0, Michigan S. Normal College Negative 3. At Ypsilanti, Michigan S. Normal College Affirmative 3, Ferris Institute Negative 0.
- Olivet College.** Olivet. Non-sectarian. Phi Beta Sigma. Coach—T. W. Nadal. Manager 1916—H. B. Thompson. Manager 1917—Glenn S. Thompson.
- Triangular Debate—Alma College, Alma, and Hope College, Holland. (See Alma College.)

University of Michigan. Ann Arbor. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Thos. C. Trueblood, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge. Ray K. Immel, Mgr.

Triangular Debate—Universities of Illinois and Wisconsin. (See University of Illinois.)

Triangular Debate—Chicago and Northwestern Universities. (See University of Chicago.)

MINNESOTA

Carleton College. Northfield. Non-sectarian. Coach—Prof. I. M. Cochran. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate—Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. Three on team. Date—March 22, 1916. Question—Resolved, that minimum wage laws should be applied to factories, workshops (including sweatshops), and department stores in the various states. Decisions—At Northfield, Carleton Affirmative 3, Knox Negative 0. At Galesburg, Knox Affirmative 0, Carleton Negative 3.

Gustavus Adolphus. St. Peter. Lutheran. Coach and Manager—Luther Malenberg.

Dual Debate—Hamline University, St. Paul. Three on team. Date—March 10, 1916. Question—Resolved, that minimum wage laws applying to factories, workshops (including sweatshops) and department stores be enacted in the various states. Decisions—At St. Paul, Hamline Affirmative 3, Gustavus Adolphus Negative 0. At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus Affirmative 0, Hamline Negative 3.

Single Debate—Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis. Three on team. Date—March 17, 1916. Place—Appleton. Question—Resolved, that minimum wage laws applying to factories (including sweatshops) and department stores be enacted in the various states. Decision—Lawrence Affirmative 2, Gustavus Adolphus Negative 1.

Single Debate—Luther College, Decora, Iowa. Three on team. Date—April 14, 1916. Place—St. Peter, Minn. Question—Resolved, that minimum wage laws applying to factories, workshops (including sweatshops) and department stores be enacted in the various states. Decision—Luther College Affirmative 0, Gustavus Adolphus Negative 3.

Hamline University. St. Paul. Methodist Episcopal. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — (See Gustavus Adolphus above.)

Triangular Debate — Coe College and Macalester. (See Macalester College below.)

Macalester College. St. Paul, Minn. Presbyterian. Coach — Prof. Glenn Clark. Manager 1916-1917 — Wallace Gibson.

Triangular Debate — Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn. Three on teams. Date — March 17, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the minimum wage be adopted for department stores, workshops (including sweatshops) and factories in the several states. Decisions — At Macalester, Coe College Affirmative, Macalester Negative. At St. Paul, Macalester Affirmative, Hamline Negative. At Cedar Rapids, Coe and Hamline. (No report.)

Single Debate — (See Lawrence College, Wisconsin.)

St. Olaf College. Northfield, Minn. Lutheran. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — (See Morningside College, Iowa.)

University of Minnesota. Minneapolis. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Haldor B. Gilson, Coach and Manager. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Universities of Illinois and Iowa. (See University of Illinois.)

Triangular Debate — Colleges of Agriculture of Iowa S. Coll. and Wisconsin University. (See Iowa State College.)

MISSOURI

Drury College. Springfield. Non-sectarian. Coach — L. E. Meader. Manager 1916 — Frank H. Hedges.

Single Debate — (See William Jewell College below.)

Missouri State Normal. Warrensburg. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — (See Kansas State Agri. College.)

Missouri University.

Triangular Debate — Texas and Colorado Universities. (See Texas.)

William Jewell College. Liberty. Baptist. Coach — Dr. E. C. Griffith. Manager 1916-1917 — Lee Conner.

Single Debate — (See Colorado College.)

Single Debate — Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina. Three on team. Date — March 31, 1916. Place — Liberty, Mo. Question — Resolved, that the United States should carry out a program of increased armament. Decision — William Jewell Affirmative 3, Kansas Wesleyan Negative 0.

Single Debate — Columbia University. Three on team. Date — April 10, 1916. Place — Liberty, Mo. Question — Resolved, that the United States should immediately and materially increase its army and navy. Decision — William Jewell Affirmative 2, Columbia University Negative 1.

Single Debate — Drury College, Springfield, Mo. Three on team. Date — April 14, 1916. Place — Liberty, Mo. Question — Resolved, that Congress should adopt a literacy test for all European immigration. Decision — Drury Affirmative 0, William Jewell Negative 3.

MONTANA

Montana State College. Bozeman. Non-sectarian. Coach — E. A. Duddy. Manager 1916-1917 — Llewellyn Luce.

Single Debate — North Dakota Agri. College, Fargo. Two on team. Date — Jan. 7, 1916. Place — Bozeman. Question — Resolved, that the Federal Government should own and operate the telegraph and telephone. Decision — Montana State College Affirmative 2, North Dakota Agri. College Negative 1.

Single Debate — Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash. Two on team. Date — Feb. 21, 1916. Place — Spokane. Question — Resolved, that the Federal Government should own and operate the telegraph and telephone. Decision — Gonzaga University Affirmative 0, Montana State Negative 3.

Single Debate — University of Idaho, Moscow. Three on team. Date — March 31, 1916. Place — Bozeman. Ques-

tion—Resolved, that a system of compulsory voting should be adopted in the United States. Decision—University of Idaho Affirmative 1, Montana State 2.

Single Debate—South Dakota Agri. College, Brookings. Two on team. Date—April 8, 1916. Place—Brookings. Question—Resolved, that the short ballot should be adopted in city, county and state government. Decision—South Dakota Agri. College Affirmative 0, Montana State 3.

University of Montana. Missoula. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach—Geo. R. Coffman. Manager 1916-1917—William G. Long.

Single Debate—University of Southern California Law School, Los Angeles. (See University of S. California Law School.)

Single Debate—University of North Dakota, Grand Forks. Two on team. Date—March 10, 1916. Place—Missoula. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a parliamentary form of government. Decision—North Dakota Affirmative 1, Montana Negative 2.

Single Debate—University of Utah, Salt Lake. Two on team. Date—March. Place—Salt Lake. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a parliamentary form of government. Decision—Montana Affirmative 0, Utah Negative 3.

Single Debate—University of Oregon, Eugene. Two on team. Date— . Place—Missoula. Question—Resolved, that the United States should maintain her navy above third rank in fighting efficiency. Decision for Montana 3-0.

NEBRASKA

Bellevue College. Bellevue. Non-sectarian. Coach—Prof. W. A. Peters. Manager 1916—W. E. Webb.

Triangular Debate—Cotner University and Doane College. (See Cotner University.)

Dual Debate—(See Nebraska Wesleyan.)

Cotner University. Bethany. Christian. Coach—Clarence

G. Miles. Manager 1916—Orville Johnson. Manager 1917—Glen McRae.

Triangular Debate—Bellevue College, Bellevue and Doane College, Crete. Three on teams. Date—March 17, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should immediately and substantially increase its armament. (Armament to mean both forces and equipment.) Decisions—At Bethany, Cotner Affirmative 0, Bellevue Negative 3. At Crete, Nebr., Doane Affirmative 3, Cotner Negative 0. At Bellevue, Bellevue Affirmative 0, Doane Negative 3.

Single Debate—Nebraska Wesleyan, University Place. Three on team. Date—April 7, 1916. Place—University Place. Question—Resolved, that the United States should immediately and substantially increase its armament. (Armament to mean both forces and equipment.) Decision—Nebraska Wesleyan Affirmative 2, Cotner Negative 1.

Doane College. Crete. Congregational. Coach—Prof. J. E. Taylor. Manager 1916–1917—H. C. Hasford.

Triangular Debate—Bellevue College and Cotner College. (See Cotner College above.)

Single Debate—Midland College, Atchison, Kans. Three on team. Date—April 28, 1916. Place—Atchison. Question—Resolved, that the United States should immediately and substantially increase its armament. Decision—Doane Affirmative 3, Midland Negative 0.

Grand Island College. Grand Island, Nebr. Baptist. Coach—Prof. Martha Firth. Manager 1916–1917—Thos. W. Noel.

Triangular Debate—Hastings College, Hastings, and Kearney State Normal. Three on team. Date—March 23, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States Legislature should enact a minimum wage law. Decisions—At Grand Island, Kearney Affirmative 0, Grand Island Negative 3. At Hastings, Grand Island Affirmative 1, Hastings Negative 2. At Kearney, Hastings Affirmative 2, Kearney Negative 1.

Hastings College. Hastings. Presbyterian. Coach—H. L. McCracken. Coach acts as manager.

Triangular Debate—Grand Island and Kearney Normal.
(See Grand Island College.)

Kearney State Normal. Kearney. No Coach. Manager
1916-1917—Geo. E. Martin.

Triangular Debate—Grand Island College and Hastings College.
(See Grand Island College.)

Dual Debate—Peru State Normal, Peru. Three on team.
Date—April 7, 1916. Question—Resolved, that a policy
of preparedness for war is desirable for the United States.
Decisions—At Kearney, Kearney Affirmative 0, Peru
Negative 3. At Peru, Peru Affirmative 3, Kearney Negative 0.

Nebraska Wesleyan University. University Place. Methodist.
Coach and Manager—Prof. E. H. Wells.

Single Debate—Cotner University. (See Cotner University
above.)

Dual Debate—Bellevue College, Bellevue. Three on team.
Date—April 21, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the
United States should immediately and substantially increase
her armament. (Armament taken to mean both men and
equipment.) Decisions—At University Place, Bellevue
Affirmative 1, Wesleyan Negative 2. At Bellevue, Wesleyan
Affirmative 1, Bellevue Negative 2.

University of Nebraska. Lincoln. Non-sectarian. Delta
Sigma Rho. Phi Alpha Tau. M. M. Fogg, Prof. of
Rhetoric, in charge. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate—Kansas University. (See Kansas University.)

NEVADA

University of Nevada. Reno. Non-sectarian. Coach—A. E.
Turner. Manager 1916—John W. Heard.

Single Debate—College of the Pacific, San José, Calif. Two
on team. Date—Dec. 10, 1915. Place—San José. Question—
Resolved, that the Federal Government should legalize industrial
combinations engaged in interstate business, without restrictions
as to size or extent of control, provided that they incorporate
under federal law and operate under the supervision of a Federal
Trade Com-

mission. Decision — University of Nevada Affirmative 2, College of the Pacific Negative 1.

Single Debate — Brigham Young College, Provo, Utah. Two on team. Date — March 31, 1916. Place — Reno. Question — Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decision — Brigham Young University Affirmative 2, University of Nevada Negative 1.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College. Hanover. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Brown and Williams. (See Brown University.)

NEW JERSEY

Princeton University. Princeton. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Harry F. Covington, Dept. of Pub. Speaking. Chairman 1915-1916 — Moore Gates. Chairman 1917-1918 — W. B. Barnitz.

Triangular Debate — Harvard and Yale. (See Harvard University.)

Triangular Debate (Freshmen) — Harvard and Yale. Three on teams. Date — May 5, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the Philippine Islands should be granted complete independence within five years. Decisions — At Princeton, Harvard Affirmative 1, Princeton Negative 2. At Cambridge, Yale Affirmative 0, Harvard Negative 3. At New Haven, Princeton Affirmative 0, Yale Negative 3.

Rutgers College. New Brunswick. Non-sectarian. Prof. Livingston Barbour in charge. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Trinity College and New York University. (See Trinity College under Connecticut.)

NEW MEXICO

State College of New Mexico. (Formerly New Mexico College of Agri. and Mech. Arts.) Coach and Manager — Sherman B. Neff.

Single Debate — University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. Three on team. Date — March 4, 1916. Place — Albu-

querque, N. Mex. Question — Resolved, that federal and state legislation providing for compulsory arbitration is essential to the settlement of disputes between employers and employees. Decision — University of New Mexico Affirmative 0, State College Negative 3.

University of New Mexico. Albuquerque. Non-sectarian. Coach and Manager — C. E. Bonnett.

Single Debate — State College of New Mexico. (See State College just above.)

Single Debate — University of Redlands. (See University of Redlands under California.)

Single Debate — University of Southern California Law. (See University of Southern California Law.)

NEW YORK

Colgate University. Hamilton. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach — Lionel D. Edie. Manager 1916 — O. A. Wepner. Manager 1917 — Carl A. Kallgren.

Single Debate — St. Lawrence, Canton, N. Y. Three on team. Date — Jan. 21, 1916. Place — Canton. Question — Resolved, that in the United States there should be a prompt and substantial increase in the army and navy. Decision — St. Lawrence Affirmative 1, Colgate Negative 2.

Triangular Debate — Ohio Wesleyan and Rochester University. Three on teams. Date — February 11, 1916. Question — Resolved, that there should be a prompt and substantial increase in the army and navy of the United States. Decisions — At Hamilton, N. Y., Colgate Affirmative 2, Ohio Wesleyan Negative 1. At Rochester, Colgate University Affirmative 1, University of Rochester Negative 2. At Delaware, Ohio, University of Rochester Affirmative 1, Ohio Wesleyan Negative 2.

Single Debate — Washington and Jefferson, Washington, Pa. Three on team. Date — Feb. 18, 1916. Place — Washington. Question — Resolved, that there should be a prompt and substantial increase in the army and navy of the United States. Decision — Colgate Affirmative 3, Washington and Jefferson Negative 0.

Single Debate—University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Three on team. Date—March 7, 1916. Place—Hamilton, N. Y. Question—Resolved, that there should be a substantial increase in the army and navy of the United States. Decision—University of Pennsylvania Affirmative 0, Colgate Negative 3.

Single Debate—Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. Three on team. Date—March 18, 1916. Place—Hamilton. Question—Resolved, that there should be a prompt and substantial increase in the army and navy of the United States. Decision—Cornell Affirmative 2, Colgate Negative 1.

Columbia University. New York. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—University of Southern California Law. (See University of Southern California Law.)

Single Debate—William Jewell College. (See William Jewell College under Missouri.)

Cornell University. Ithaca. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. (No report 1916.) J. A. Winans, Prof. Public Speaking, in charge.

Single Debate—(See Colgate University.)

Hamilton College. Clinton. Non-sectarian. Prof. Calvin L. Lewis, Dept. Rhetoric and Oratory, in charge.

Single Debate—Syracuse University. (See Syracuse University below.)

Triangular Debate—Bowdoin College and Wesleyan College. (See Bowdoin College, Maine.)

New York University. New York City. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach—Charles A. Tonsor, Jr. Manager 1916-1917—David Weshner.

Triangular Debate—Trinity College and Rutgers College. (See Trinity College, Conn.)

Syracuse University. Syracuse. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach—S. L. Kennedy. Manager 1915-1916—Kenneth Brown. Manager 1916-1917—Elmer Turner.

Single Debate—Pennsylvania University, Philadelphia. Three on team. Date—Feb., 1916. Place—Philadelphia. Question—Resolved, that the administration pol-

icy of armament increase is demanded by the best interests of the United States. Decision—Syracuse Affirmative 3, Pennsylvania Univ. Negative 0.

Dual Debate—Yale University, New Haven. Three on team. Date—December, 1915. Question—Resolved, that immigration should be further restricted by a literacy test. Decision—At Syracuse, Syracuse University Affirmative 2, Yale Negative 1. At New Haven, Yale Affirmative 0, Syracuse Negative 3.

Single Debate—Cornell University, Ithaca. Three on team. Date—Feb., 1916. Place—Syracuse. Question—Resolved, that the Administration Policy of Armament Increase is demanded by the best interests of the United States. Decision—Cornell Affirmative 2, Syracuse Negative 1.

University of Rochester. Rochester. Non-sectarian. Coach—Lester O. Wilder. Manager 1915-1916—C. T. Leighton. Manager 1916-1917—Glen C. Morrow.

Triangular Debate—Ohio Wesleyan University and Colgate University. (See Colgate University.)

Single Debate—Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. Three on team. Date—Feb. 11, 1916. Place—Oberlin. Question—Resolved, that there should be a prompt and substantial increase in the army and navy of the United States. Decision—Rochester Affirmative 1, Oberlin Negative 2.

NORTH CAROLINA

Davidson College. Davidson. Presbyterian. No coach. Manager 1916—J. G. Patton, Jr. Manager 1917—Prof. A. Currie.

Single Debate—Emory College. (See Emory College, Georgia.)

Single Debate—Erskine College, Due West, S. C. Two on team. Date—April 7, 1916. Place—Rock Hill, S. C. Question—Resolved, that the Ship Purchase Bill introduced by Mr. Alexander in the House of Representatives should be passed by Congress. Decision—Erskine Affirmative 0, Davidson Negative 3.

North Carolina Agricultural College. West Raleigh. Non-

sectarian. George Summey, Jr., Associate Prof. of English, in charge. Manager—J. H. Speas.

Single Debate—Alabama Polytechnic, Auburn, Ala. Two on team. Date—Jan. 29, 1916. Place—West Raleigh. Question—Resolved, that the British policy of non-interference in the people's affairs makes for higher civilization than the German policy of governmental control. Decision—North Carolina Agricultural College Affirmative won.

Triangular Debate—Alabama Polytechnic and University of Georgia. Two on teams. Date—May 3, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should have a system of farm credits based on governmental aid rather than on coöperation among farmers. Decisions—At Athens, Georgia, North Carolina Agri. College v. Ala. Poly. Negative won. At West Raleigh, North Carolina Agri. College Affirmative 3, University of Georgia Negative 0. At Auburn, Alabama Polytechnic and University of Georgia. (No report.)

Trinity College. Durham. Methodist Episcopal South. Coach and Manager—Holland Holton. Tau Kappa Alpha.

Single Debate—Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va. Three on team. Date—Feb. 26, 1916. Place—Durham, N. C. Question—Resolved, that the proposed administration policy of armament increase is demanded by the best interests of the United States. Decision—Trinity Affirmative 2, Washington and Lee Negative 1.

Single Debate—Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. Three on team. Date—March 24, 1916. Place—Durham, N. C. Question—Resolved, that an international policy force should be established to enforce international treaties and agreements and to maintain peace. Decision—Trinity Affirmative 2, Swarthmore College Negative 1.

University of North Carolina. Chapel Hill. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. No coach. Debate Union manages. **Triangular Debate**—Johns Hopkins and University of Virginia. (See Johns Hopkins University, Maryland.)

Wake Forest College. Wake Forest. Baptist. G. W. Paschal, in charge. Manager 1916-1917 — Carey J. Hunter, Jr.

Dual Debate — Richmond College, Richmond, Va. Two on team. Date — April 24, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the United States should subsidize merchant marine engaged in foreign commerce. Decisions — At Richmond, Richmond Affirmative 0, Wake Forest Negative 3. At Raleigh, N. C., Wake Forest Affirmative 3, Richmond Negative 0.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fargo College. Fargo. Non-sectarian. Coach and Manager — L. D. Benedict.

Single Debate — North Dakota University. Three on team. Date — March 31, 1916. Place — Fargo. Question — Resolved, that the several states should enact minimum wage legislation for unskilled labor, constitutionality conceded. Decision — North Dakota University Affirmative 1, Fargo College Negative 2.

Dual Debate — Jamestown College, N. D. Three on team. Date — March 17, 1916. Question — Resolved, that minimum wage legislation should be enacted for department stores, factories, mines, workshops, including sweatshops, constitutionality conceded. Decisions — At Jamestown, Jamestown College Affirmative 0, Fargo College Negative 3. At Fargo, Fargo College Affirmative 1, Jamestown College Negative 2.

Jamestown College. Jamestown. Presbyterian. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — (See Fargo College above.)

North Dakota Agricultural College. Fargo. Non-sectarian. Coach and Manager — Alfred G. Arvold.

Single Debate — Montana State College. (See Montana State College.)

Dual Debate — Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, Ore. Three on team. Date — Jan. 10, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the Federal Government should own and operate all telephone and telegraph lines in the United

States. Decisions—At Fargo, North Dakota Agri. College Affirmative 2, Oregon Agri. College Negative 1. At Corvallis, Oregon Agri. College Affirmative 1, North Dakota Agri. College Negative 2.

University of North Dakota. Grand Forks. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Prof. John Adams Taylor and Dr. James E. Boyle in charge. Manager 1916—John Hesketh.

Single Debate—University of Montana. (See University of Montana.)

Single Debate—Manitoba University, Canada. Three on team. Date—Feb. 25, 1916. Place—Grand Forks, N. D. Question—Resolved, that the United States should have intervened to maintain the neutrality of Belgium. Decision—North Dakota Affirmative 0, Manitoba Negative 3.

OHIO

Baldwin-Wallace College. Berea. Methodist Episcopal. G. F. Collier, Debate Correspondent.

Triangular Debate—Heidelberg University and Hiram College. Three on teams. Date—March 3, 1916. Question—Resolved, that state and local revenues should be derived through a single tax on the economic rent of land. Decisions—At Berea, Baldwin-Wallace Affirmative 1, Heidelberg Negative 2. At Hiram, Hiram Affirmative 3, Baldwin-Wallace Negative 0. At Tiffin, Heidelberg Affirmative 2, Hiram Negative 1.

Denison University. Granville. Baptist. Coach—Bunyan Spencer. Manager 1916-1917—B. C. Morris.

Dual Debate—University of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio. Three on team. Date—March 20, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decisions—At Granville, Denison Affirmative 2, Wooster Negative 1. At Wooster, Wooster Affirmative 3, Denison Negative 0.

Dual Debate—Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio. Three on team. Date—March 24, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doc-

trine. Decisions. At Granville, Marietta Affirmative 0, Denison Negative 3. At Marietta, Denison Affirmative 3, Marietta Negative 0.

Triangular Debate (Women) — Muskingum, New Concord, and Ohio University, Athens. Three on teams. Date — April 18, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the Philippines should be given their independence not later than 1920, constitutionality conceded. Decisions — At Granville, Muskingum Affirmative 2, Denison Negative 1. At Athens, Denison Affirmative 2, Ohio University Negative 1. At New Concord, Muskingum and Ohio University. (No report.)

Heidelberg University. Tiffin. Coach — Prof. R. A. Swink, in charge. Manager 1916 — C. A. Warner. Manager 1917 — Harrison Zellner.

Triangular Debate — Baldwin-Wallace University and Hiram College. (See Baldwin-Wallace University.)

Single Debate — Detroit University, Detroit, Mich. Three on team. Date — Jan. 29, 1916. Place — Detroit. Question — Resolved, that state and local revenues should be derived through a single tax on the economic rent of land. Decision — Heidelberg Affirmative 1, University of Detroit Negative 2.

Single Debate — Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. Three on team. Date — March 8, 1916. Place — Richmond, Ind. Question — Resolved, that state and local revenues should be derived through a single tax on the economic rent of land. Decision — Heidelberg Affirmative 2, Earlham College Negative 1.

Hiram College. Hiram. Non-sectarian. Marshall Pancoast, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Baldwin-Wallace and Heidelberg. (See Baldwin-Wallace, Ohio.)

Marietta College. Marietta. Non-sectarian. Coach and Manager — A. G. Beach.

Mt. Union College. Alliance. Methodist. No report 1916. (See Muskingum College below.)

Dual Debate — (See Denison University.)

Muskingum. New Concord. United Presbyterian. Tau

Kappa Alpha. Chas. R. Layton, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge.

Triangular—Mt. Union College, Alliance and Otterbein Univ., Westerville. Three on teams. Date—March, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the Initiative and Referendum as part of the governmental system of Ohio should be abolished. Constitutionality conceded. Decisions—At New Concord, Otterbein Negative won 2 to 1. At Alliance, Muskingum Negative 3 to 0. At Westerville, no report.

Versus Otterbein—second debate—At Westerville, Muskingum Negative won 3 to 0. Initiative and referendum question.

Triangular Debate—Denison University and Ohio University. (See Denison University.)

Oberlin College. Oberlin. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho.(?) (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—(See University of Rochester, New York.)

Ohio State University. Columbus. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. V. A. Ketcham, Dept. of English, in charge. (No report 1916.)

Ohio University. Athens. Non-sectarian. Coach and Manager—Prof. H. R. Pierce. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—(See Denison University.)

Ohio Wesleyan University. Delaware. Methodist Episcopal. Delta Sigma Rho. Prof. Charles N. Newcomb, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge.

Triangular Debate—(See Colgate University, New York.)

Otterbein University. Westerville. United Brethren. No report 1916. (See Muskingum College, Ohio, above.)

Western Reserve University. Cleveland. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach—H. S. Woodard. Manager 1916—Ross McD. Coen, 11431 Euclid Ave. (No report 1916.)

Wilberforce University. Wilberforce. African Methodist Episcopal. Coach—Prof. L. F. Palmer. Manager 1916—H. W. Sheppard. (No report 1916.)

Wooster, University of. Wooster. Presbyterian. Delbert G. Lean, Prof. of Public Speaking, in charge. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — (See Denison University.)

Dual Debate — (See Allegheny College, Penn.)

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. Stillwater. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach and Manager — Isadore Samuels.

Single Debate — Phillips University, Enid, Okla. Three on team. Date — April 7, 1916. Place — Enid, Okla. Question — Resolved, that the United States should rely upon military and naval preparedness for future safety and the maintenance of peace. Decision — Oklahoma A. & M. Affirmative 1, Phillips Negative 2.

Single Debate — Oklahoma University, Norman. (Women.) Three on team. Date — April 10, 1916. Place — Stillwater. Question — Resolved, that there should be a material increase in the military and naval armament of the United States over that provided for on August 1, 1915. Decision — Oklahoma A. & M. Affirmative 3, Oklahoma University Negative 0.

Dual Debate — Southwestern College, Kans. (See Southwestern College under Kansas.)

Phillips University. Enid. Coach and Manager — C. C. Taylor. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate — Oklahoma A. & M. (See Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, just above.)

University of Oklahoma. Norman. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate — Oklahoma A. & M. (See Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.)

Single Debate — (See Texas University.)

Triangular Debate — Kansas and Colorado. (See Kansas University.)

OREGON

Oregon Agricultural College. Corvallis. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — North Dakota Agri. (See North Dakota Agricultural College.)

Albany College. Albany. Presbyterian. (No report 1916.)
Single Debate—Pacific College. (See Pacific College just below.)

Pacific College. Newberg. Coach—M. D. Hawkins. Manager 1915-1916, 1916-1917—Lloyd Edwards.

Single Debate—Albany College, Albany, Oregon. Two on team. Date—May 13, 1916. Place—Albany. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt the essential features of the Swiss system of military training. Decision—Albany Affirmative 2, Pacific Negative 1.

University of Oregon. Eugene. Non-sectarian. Coach—Robert W. Prescott. (No report 1916.)

Triangular—Stanford Univ. Calif. and Univ. of Wash. (See under Calif.)

Single Debate—(See University of Montana.)

Willamette University. Salem. Methodist Episcopal. Coach—Prof. M. L. Senn. Manager 1916—John L. Gray. (No report 1916.)

PENNSYLVANIA

Allegheny College. Meadville. Methodist Episcopal. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach—Stanley S. Swartly. Manager 1916—William A. Ellis. Manager 1917—Robert McCreary.

Dual Debate—Wooster. (Canceled.)

Single Debate—Washington & Jefferson. (Canceled.)

Single Debate—Colgate. (Canceled.)

Bucknell University. Lewisburg. Non-sectarian. Coach—Charles C. Fries. Manager 1916—C. W. Potter.

Dual Debate—Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. Three on team. Date—April 28, 1916. Question—Resolved, that an international police force for the purpose of enforcing international treaties and agreements and of maintaining international peace should be established. Decisions—At Lewisburg, Lafayette Affirmative 2, Bucknell Negative 1. At Easton, Bucknell Affirmative 1, Lafayette Negative 2.

Dual Debate—Pennsylvania State College, State College. Three on team. Date—May 5, 1916. Question—Resolved, that an international police force for the purpose

of enforcing international treaties and agreements and of maintaining international peace should be established. Decisions — At Lewisburg, Bucknell Affirmative 2, Penn. State Negative 1. At State College, Penn. State Affirmative 3, Bucknell Negative 0.

Dickinson College. Carlisle. Non-sectarian. No coach. Prof. W. W. Landis acts as manager.

Quadrangular Debate — Franklin and Marshall, State College, and Swarthmore College. Three on teams. March 3, 1916. Question — Resolved, that an international police force should be established to enforce international treaties and to preserve international peace. Decisions — At Swarthmore, Franklin and Marshall Affirmative 1, Swarthmore Negative 2. At State College, Swarthmore Affirmative 0, State College Negative 3. At Carlisle and Lancaster. (No report.)

Single Debate — University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg. Three on team. Date — March 8, 1916. Place — Carlisle. Question — (Same as that in the Quadrangular above.) Decision — (No report.)

Franklin and Marshall College. Lancaster. Reform in U. S. Prof. A. V. Heister in charge. (No report 1916.)

Quadrangular Debate — (See Dickinson College for partial report.)

Lafayette College. Easton. Presbyterian. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — Bucknell University. (See Bucknell University.)

Pennsylvania State College. State College. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. (?) Coaches — J. H. Frizzell and Wm. Lewis Roberts, Eng. Dept. (No report 1916.)

Quadrangular Debate — (See partial report under Dickinson College.)

Swarthmore College. Swarthmore. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach — Philip M. Hicks. Manager 1916 — Hugh F. Denworth. Manager 1917 — Clarence G. Myers.

Quadrangular Debate — Franklin and Marshall, State College, and Dickinson College. (See partial report under Dickinson College.)

Single Debate — Trinity College. (See Trinity College, N. Carolina.)

University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Prof. F. A. Child in charge. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate — (See Syracuse University, New York.)

Single Debate — (See Colgate University, New York.)

University of Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh. Non-sectarian. Coach — F. H. Lane. Manager 1916 — F. W. Glaser. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate — (See partial report under Dickinson College.)

Washington and Jefferson. Washington. Non-sectarian. Prof. Wilbur Jones Kay in charge. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate — (See Colgate University, New York.)

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University. Providence. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach — Prof. H. B. Huntington. Manager 1916 — A. F. Willis-ton. Manager 1917 — N. L. Fishel.

Triangular Debate — Dartmouth and Williams. Three on team. Date — March 24, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the cities of New England of over 100,000 population, with the exception of Boston, should adopt some plan of city management. Decisions — At Providence, Williams Affirmative 1, Brown Negative 2. At Hanover, N. H., Brown Affirmative 1, Dartmouth Negative 2. At Williamstown, Mass., Dartmouth Affirmative 2, Williams Negative 1.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clemson Agricultural College. Clemson College. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — College of Charleston and Wofford College. (See College of Charleston just below.)

College of Charleston. Charleston. Non-sectarian. Coach — Prof. L. M. Harris, Eng. Dept., in charge. N. W. Stephenson, Prof. of History, Chairman of Debate Council.

Triangular Debate — Clemson Agricultural College and Wofford College. Three on team. Date — April 29, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the President's program for

preparedness as set forth in his message to the 64th Congress should be supported by Congress. Decisions—At Charleston, College of Charleston Affirmative, Wofford Negative. Wofford won. At Clemson College, Clemson College Affirmative, College of Charleston Negative. College of Charleston won. At Spartanburg, Wofford College Affirmative, Clemson College Negative. (Debate still pending at time of report.)

University of South Carolina. Columbia. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—Universities of Georgia and Tennessee. (See University of Tennessee.)

Wofford College. Spartanburg. Methodist Episcopal South. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate—College of Charleston and Clemson College. (See College of Charleston above.)

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College. Canton. Coach and Manager—John D. G. Berdahl.

Triangular Debate—Academy of St. Olaf College and Waldorf College Academy. Three on teams. Date—April 29, 1916. Question—Resolved, that Congress make a substantial increase in its appropriations for National Defense. Decisions—At Canton, Augustana College Academy Affirmative 1, Waldorf College Academy Negative 2. At Northfield, Minn., St. Olaf Academy Affirmative 3, Augustana Academy Negative 0. At Forest City, Iowa, Waldorf College Academy Affirmative 0, St. Olaf Academy Negative 3.

Dakota Wesleyan University. Mitchell. Methodist Episcopal. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach and Manager—Elmer Harrison Wilds.

Triangular Debate—Huron College and Yankton College. Three on teams. Date—March 3, 1916. Question—Resolved, that Socialistic Control of the means of production and exchange would be preferable to the present Capitalistic System. Decisions—At Huron, Dakota Wesleyan Affirmative 1, Huron Negative 2. At Mitchell,

Yankton College Affirmative 0, Dakota Wesleyan Negative 3. At Yankton, Huron College Affirmative 0, Yankton Negative 3.

Triangular Debate—Morningside College and St. Olaf College. (See Morningside College, Iowa.)

Huron College. Huron. Presbyterian. Coach—Everett Lee Hunt. Manager 1916—C. J. Boe.

Triangular Debate—Dakota Wesleyan University and Yankton College. (See Dakota Wesleyan University just above.)

Triangular Debate (Women)—University of South Dakota and Morningside. (See Morningside College, Iowa.)

South Dakota Agricultural College. Brookings. Non-sectarian. Coach—H. W. Ewing. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—(See Montana State College.)

South Dakota Northern Normal. Aberdeen. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—Madison, S. D. Two on team. Date—May 18, 1916. Place—Madison. Question—Resolved, that the United States should immediately and substantially increase her armament. (Armament to mean both forces and equipment.) Decision—Northern Normal Affirmative 0, Madison Negative 3.

University of South Dakota. Vermillion. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach and Manager—Clarence E. Lyon.

Triangular Debate—Iowa State College and Kansas State College. (See Iowa State College.)

Triangular Debate—Morningside College and Huron College. (See Morningside College under Iowa.)

Yankton College. Yankton. Congregational. Coach—Cornelius C. Cunningham. Manager 1916—Egbert J. Beyer. Manager 1917—Lewis C. Morrison.

Triangular Debate—Dakota Wesleyan University and Huron College. (See Dakota Wesleyan University.)

TENNESSEE

Knoxville College. Knoxville. United Presbyterian. Coach—H. M. Telford.

Triangular Debate—Morehouse College and Talladega College. Two on team. Date—April 14, 1916. Question—Resolved, that immigration to the United States should be restricted by a literacy test. Decisions. At Knoxville, Knoxville College Affirmative 3, Morehouse College Negative 0. At Talladega, Ala., Talladega College Affirmative 3, Knoxville College Negative 0. At Atlanta, Morehouse College Affirmative 2, Talladega College Negative 1.

University of Tennessee. Knoxville. Non-sectarian. Coach and Manager 1916—Howard L. Bevis.

Triangular Debate—Universities of Georgia and South Carolina. Two on teams. Date—May 6, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should extend its system of subsidies to its merchant marine engaged in foreign trade. Decisions—At Athens, Georgia, University of Tennessee Affirmative 1, South Carolina Negative 4. At Columbia, S. Car., University of Georgia Affirmative 3, University of Tennessee Negative 2. At Knoxville. (No report.)

TEXAS

Baylor University. Waco. Baptist. No coach. Manager 1916—H. G. Moore.

Single Debate—Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas. Two on team. Date—April 24, 1916. Place—Georgetown, Texas. Question—Resolved, that the United States is justified in permitting the exportation of munitions of war in the present European conflict. Decision—Southwestern University Affirmative 1, Baylor University Negative 2.

Triangular Debate—Louisiana State University and Southern Methodist University. (See Louisiana State University.)

Southwestern University. Georgetown. Methodist Episcopal. Coach—Prof. Dwight Wenzel. Manager 1916—A. Ward Wilson.

Triangular Debate—Trinity University, Waxahachie, Tex., and Texas Christian University, Ft. Worth. Two on

teams. Date — Feb. 18, 1916. Question — Resolved, that the several states should adopt schedules of minimum wages for unskilled labor, constitutionality conceded. Decisions — At Waxahachie, Trinity Affirmative 2, Southwestern Negative 1. At Georgetown, Southwestern Affirmative 1, Texas Christian College Negative 2. At Ft. Worth. (No report.)

Single Debate — Baylor University. (See Baylor University above.)

Texas Christian University. Fort Worth. Disciples. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Southwestern University and Trinity University. (See Southwestern University just above.)

Trinity University. Waxahachie. Presbyterian. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Trinity College and Southwestern University. (See Southwestern University, Texas.)

University of Texas. Austin. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach and Manager — John R. Pelsma.

Triangular Debate — Colorado University, Boulder, and Missouri University, Columbia. Two on teams. Date — April 14, 1916. Question — Resolved, that a material increase in the armaments of the United States, over that obtained and provided for on August 1, 1915, is justifiable. Decisions — At Austin, Texas Affirmative 2, Missouri 1. At Boulder, Colo., Colorado Affirmative 0, Texas Negative 3. At Columbia, Missouri and Colorado. (No report.)

Single Debate — Oklahoma University, Norman. Two on team. Date — April 10, 1916. Place — Austin. Question — Resolved, that there should be a material increase in the naval and military armaments of the United States over that provided for on August 1, 1915. Decision — Oklahoma Affirmative 1, Texas Negative 2.

Single Debate — Arkansas University, Fayetteville. Two on team. Date — April 17, 1916. Place — Austin. Question — Resolved, that a material increase in the armaments of the United States, over that provided for on August 1, 1915, is justifiable. Decision — Arkansas Affirmative 0, Texas Negative 3.

Single Debate—Arizona University, Tucson. Two on team. Date—May 1, 1916. Place—Tucson. Question—Resolved, that a material increase in the armaments of the United States, over that obtained and provided for on August 1, 1915, is justifiable. Decision—Arizona Affirmative 1, Texas Negative 2.

Single Debate—University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Two on team. Date—April 26, 1916. Place—Los Angeles. Question—Resolved, that a material increase in the armaments of the United States, over that obtained and provided for on August 1, 1915, is justifiable. Decision—Southern California Affirmative 0, Texas Negative 3.

UTAH

Brigham Young University. Provo. Latter Day Saints. Coach—John C. Swenson. Manager 1915-1916—LeRoy Hafen. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—(See University of Nevada.)

Triangular Debate—Utah Agricultural College and University of Utah. (See Utah Agricultural College, just below.)

University of Utah. Salt Lake. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach—Charles Wilbert Snow. Manager 1916—William Ferguson.

Triangular Debate—Utah Agricultural College and Brigham Young. (See Utah Agricultural College.)

Single Debate—(See Montana University.)

Utah Agricultural College. Logan. Non-sectarian. Coach—Prof. Geo. B. Hendricks. Manager 1916—S. J. Quinney.

Triangular Debate—Brigham University, Provo, and University of Utah, Salt Lake. Two on teams. Date—Feb. 25, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decisions—At Logan, Utah Agri. College Affirmative 1, University of Utah Negative 2. At Provo, Brigham Young Affirmative 1, Utah Agri. College Negative 2. At Salt Lake, University of Utah and Brigham Young University. (No report.)

Dual Debate—University of Idaho, Moscow. Two on team. Date—March 27, 1916. Question—Resolved, that a system of compulsory voting should be adopted by the United States. Decision—At Moscow, University of Idaho Affirmative 1, Utah Agri. College Negative 0. At Logan. (No report.)

VIRGINIA

Emory and Henry College. Emory. Methodist Episcopal South. No coach. Manager 1916-1917—A. G. Sanders.

Single Debate—Virginia Military Institute, Lexington. Two on team. Date—April 1, 1916. Place—Emory. Question—Resolved, that the Philippine Islands should be given their independence by 1925. Decision—Virginia Military Institute Affirmative 0, Emory and Henry Negative 3.

Single Debate—Hampden-Sidney College, Hampden-Sidney, Va. Two on team. Date—April 18, 1916. Place—Hampden-Sidney. Question—Resolved, that the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors would prove beneficial to Virginia. Decision—Emory and Henry Affirmative 3, Hampden-Sidney College Negative 0.

Hampden-Sidney College. Hampden-Sidney. Presbyterian. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—Emory and Henry College. (See Emory and Henry College above.)

Triangular Debate—(See Randolph-Macon.)

Randolph-Macon. Ashland. Methodist. Tau Kappa Alpha. No coach. Manager 1916—G. W. Bush.

Triangular Debate—Hampden-Sidney and William and Mary. Two on team. Date—March 24, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine as the governing policy in international affairs. Decisions—At Ashland, Va., Randolph-Macon Affirmative 3, William and Mary Negative 0. At Williamsburg, William and Mary Affirmative 1, Randolph-Macon Negative 2. (Hampden-Sidney did not debate.)

Single Debate—Richmond College, Richmond. Two on

team. Date—April 28, 1916. Place—Ashland. Question—Resolved, that Congress should carry out President Wilson's program for national defense. Decision—Richmond College Affirmative 2, Randolph-Macon Negative 1.

Richmond College. Richmond. Baptist. Coach—Dr. D. R. Anderson. R. C. McDanel, Sec'y Debating and Forensic Council.

Dual Debate—Wake Forest College. (See Wake Forest College, N. Car.)

Single Debate—Randolph-Macon. (See Randolph-Macon College, above.)

Roanoke College. Salem. Lutheran. Coach—Dr. J. G. Randall. Manager 1916—Fred Broad.

Single Debate—William and Mary College, Williamsburg. Two on team. Date—April 7, 1916. Place—Salem. Question—Resolved, that the United States should relinquish the Monroe Doctrine. Decision—William and Mary Affirmative 1, Roanoke College Negative 2.

University of Virginia. Charlottesville. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach—C. W. Paul, Adjunct Prof. of Public Speaking. Manager—The Debating and Oratorical Council of Univ. of Virginia.

Triangular Debate—Johns Hopkins and University of North Carolina. (See Johns Hopkins University, Maryland.)

Virginia Military Institute. Lexington. State. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—(See Emory and Henry College, Virginia.)

Washington and Lee. Lexington. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach—Paul D. Converse. Manager 1916—G. D. Hancock. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate—(See Trinity College, North Carolina.)

William and Mary. Williamsburg. Non-sectarian. No coach. James S. Wilson in charge. Manager 1916—W. C. Ferguson.

Dual Debate—Randolph-Macon. (See Randolph-Macon, Va.)

Single Debate—Roanoke College. (See Roanoke College, Va.)

WASHINGTON

Gonzaga University. Spokane. R. Catholic. Coach — W. I. Lonergan. Coach acts as manager.

Single Debate — (See Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.)

Dual Debate — University of Idaho, Moscow. Three on team. Date — April 14, 1916. Question — Resolved, that a system of compulsory voting should be adopted in the United States. Decision — At Moscow, University of Idaho Affirmative 2, Gonzaga University Negative 1. At Spokane, Gonzaga University Affirmative 0, University of Idaho Negative 3.

University of Washington. Spokane. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. William LaFollette, Coach and Manager. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Leland Stanford and University of Oregon. (See Leland Stanford University, California.)

Washington State College. Pullman. Non-sectarian. (No report 1916.)

Dual Debate — (See Idaho University.)

WISCONSIN

Beloit College. Beloit. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate (Freshmen) — (See Lawrence College below.)

Carroll College. Waukesha. Presbyterian. Phi Alpha Tau. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Northwestern College, Ill., and Ripon College, Wis. (See Northwestern College under Illinois.)

Lawrence College. Appleton. Methodist Episcopal. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach — F. Wesley Orr. (No report 1916.)

Single Debate — (See Cornell College, under Iowa.)

Single Debate — (See Gustavus Adolphus, Minnesota.)

Single Debate — Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn. Three on team. Date — March 21, 1916. Place — Minneapolis. Question — Resolved, that minimum wage laws should be applied to factories, workshops (including sweatshops),

and department stores in the various states. Decision — Macalester Affirmative 0, Lawrence Negative 3.

Triangular Debate—Beloit College and Carroll College. Three on teams. Date—March 8, 1916. Question—Resolved, that minimum wage laws should be applied to all factories, workshops (including sweatshops), and department stores in the various states. Decisions—At Beloit, Lawrence Affirmative 1, Beloit Negative 2. At Carroll, Beloit Affirmative 2, Carroll Negative 1. At Lawrence, Carroll Affirmative 2, Lawrence Negative 1.

Ripon College. Ripon. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. Coach—H. P. Boody. Manager 1916—Delmar D. Wensink.

Triangular Debate—Northwestern College, Naperville, Ill., and Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis. (See Northwestern College, Illinois.)

State Normal School. Oshkosh, Wis. Non-sectarian. No one coach. F. R. Clow, with assistants, took charge of the coaching. Manager 1916—Lynne Halverson.

Triangular Debate—Indiana State Normal, Terre Haute, and Illinois Normal, Normal, Ill. Three on teams. Date—April 28, 1916. Question—Resolved, that the Principle of State Socialism is superior to the principle of free Competition. Decisions—At Oshkosh, Oshkosh Affirmative 2, Terre Haute Negative 1. At Normal, Ill., Illinois State Normal Affirmative 1, Oshkosh Negative 2. At Terre Haute, Illinois Normal and Indiana State Normal. (No report.)

Single Debate—Stevens Point Normal, Stevens Point. Three on team. Date—March 30, 1916. Place—Stevens Point. Question—Resolved, that the principle of State Socialism is superior to the principle of free competition. Decision—Oshkosh Affirmative 0, Stevens Point Negative 3.

Stevens Point Normal School. Stevens Point. Coaches and Managers—M. M. Ames and Jos. E. Delzell.

Single Debate—(See State Normal School, Oshkosh, Wis., just above.)

Triangular Debate—River Falls Normal and Superior Normal. Three on teams. Date—April 14, 1916. Question

— Resolved, that the government should own and operate all interstate telephone and telegraph lines. Decisions — At Stevens Point, Stevens Point Affirmative 2, Superior Negative 1. At River Falls, River Falls Affirmative 1, Stevens Point Negative 2. At Superior, River Falls and Superior. (No report.)

University of Wisconsin. Madison. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. (No report 1916.)

Triangular Debate — Colleges of Agriculture of Iowa State College and Minnesota University. (See Iowa State College, under Iowa.)

Triangular Debate — Universities of Illinois and Michigan. (See University of Illinois.)

WYOMING

University of Wyoming. Laramie. Coach — R. B. Pease. Manager 1916 — Bernard Howell.

Triangular Debate — Colorado Agricultural College and University of Denver. (See Colorado Agricultural College.)

APPENDIX II

RECORD OF DEBATE QUESTIONS 1915-1916

	KIND	AFF. NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Arms and Ammunition, Federal manufacture and sale of			
Iowa State (Ames), Mich. Ag., Purdue, Ind.	Triangular	2	1
Boycott should be legalized			
Hillsdale, Ypsilanti (Mich.)...	Dual	1	1
Cabinet Form of Government			
North Dakota vs. Montana Univ.	Single		1
City Manager			
Morningside, Dakota Wes- leyan, St. Olaf.	Triangular	2	1
Brown, Dartmouth, Williams..	Triangular	1	2
Compulsory Arbitration			
Univ. of N. Mexico vs. State Coll. of N. Mexico.....	Single		1
Compulsory Industrial Insurance			
Universities of Ill., Ia. and Minn.	Triangular	2	1
Compulsory Military Training and service			
Pomona, Redlands, and Univ. of S. Calif.	Triangular		3
Throop College, Redlands.....	Single		1
J. Hopkins, Universities of Va. and N. Car.	Triangular	2	1
Swiss system —			
Harvard, Princeton, Yale....	Triangular	2	1

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Albany (Ore.) v. Pacific Grove (Ore.)	Single	I		
Compulsory Service in Militia				
Alma, Hope, Olivet (Mich.)....	Triangular	I	2	
Compulsory Voting				
Idaho Univ. v. Montana State Coll.	Single		I	
Idaho Univ. v. Utah Agri. Coll.	Single	I		
Idaho v. Gonzaga Univ. (Wash.)	Dual	I	I	
County Commission Form of Gov- ernment				
Earlham Coll. v. Indiana Univ.	Single			
English Government v. German				
N. Car. Agri. Coll. v. Ala. Poly.	Single	I		
English Gov't more Democratic than U. S. Government				
Davidson Coll. (N. C.) v. Emory Coll. (Ga.)	Single		I	
N. Dak. Univ. v. Montana Univ.	Single		I	
Montana Univ. v. Utah Univ...	Single		I	
Exportation of munitions				
Southwestern Univ. v. Baylor Univ. (Texas)	Single		I	
Government ownership of inter- state railroads				
Stanford Univ. v. Univ. of Calif.	Single	I		
Univ. of S. Calif. v. Stanford..	Single	I		
Univ. of N. Mex. v. Univ. of Redlands	Single		I	
Southwestern Coll. (Kans.) v. Redlands	Single	I		
Chicago Univ. v. Northwestern Univ. (Freshmen)	Single	I		
Government ownership of Mer- chant Marine				
Pomona Coll., Occidental Coll., Univ. of S. Calif.	Triangular	2	I	

	KIND	AFF. NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Erskine Coll. (S. C.) v. David- son Coll. (N. C.).....	Single		1
Government ownership of Tele- graph and Telephone			
Rutgers Coll. (N. J.) v. N. Y. Univ., Trinity Coll. (Conn.)..	Triangular		3
Iowa State Coll. (Ames), Kans. State Coll., S. Dak. Univ.	Triangular	1	2
Univ. of Ill., Univ. of Mich., Univ. of Wis.	Triangular		2 1
Montana State Coll. v. N. Dak. Agri. Coll.	Single	1	
Gonzaga Univ. (Wash.) v. Mont. State Coll.	Single		1
Ore. Agri. Coll. v. N. Dak. Agri. Coll.	Dual	1	1
Stevens Point, River Falls, Su- perior (Wis.) Normals.....	Triangular	1	1 1
Immigration, Literacy Test			
Denver Univ. v. Univ. of S. Calif. Law	Single		1
Colo. Agri. Coll., Denver Univ., Univ. of Wy.	Triangular	2	1
Denver Univ. v. Colo. Coll.....	Single	1	
Wm. Jewell (Mo.) v. Colo. Coll.	Single		1
Bradley Poly. (Ill.) v. Augus- tana Coll. (Ill.).....	Single		1
Northwestern Coll. (Ill.), Car- roll, and Ripon colleges (Wis.)	Triangular	2	1
Morningside Coll. (Ia.), Huron (S. Dak.), Univ. of S. Dak. (Women)	Triangular	1	2
Kans. State Coll., Warrensburg Normal (Mo.) (Women).....	Dual	2	
Bates Coll. (Me.), Tufts Coll. (Mass.), Clark Coll. (Mass.)..	Triangular	2	1

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Hillsdale, Hope, and Kalamazoo Colleges (Mich.)	Triangular	2	I	
Drury Coll. (Mo.), Wm. Jewell Coll. (Mo.)	Single		I	
Syracuse Univ., Yale Univ.....	Dual	I	I	
Talladega Coll. (Ala.), Knox- ville Coll. (Tenn.), Morehouse Coll. (Ga.)	Triangular	3		
Chicago, Northwestern, and Michigan universities	Triangular	I	I	I
Increased Armament				
Kans. State Agri. Coll. v. Kans. Wesleyan Univ. (Women)...	Dual	2		
Kans. Univ. v. Nebraska Univ..	Dual	I	I	
Wm. Jewell Coll. v. Kans. Wes- leyan Univ.	Single	I		
Wm. Jewell Coll. v. Columbia Univ.	Single	I		
Cotner, Bellevue, Doane col- leges (Nebr.)	Triangular	I	2	
Nebr. Wesleyan v. Cotner Coll.	Single	I		
Doane Coll. (Nebr.) v. Midland Coll. (Kans.)	Single	I		
Nebr. Wesleyan v. Bellevue Coll. (Nebr.)	Dual		2	
Okla. Agri. and Mech. Coll. v. Okla. Univ.	Single	I		
S. Dak. Normals—Aberdeen and Madison	Single		I	
Texas, Mo., and Colo. universi- ties	Triangular	I	I	I
Okla. Univ. v. Texas Univ....	Single		I	
Arkansas Univ. v. Texas Univ..	Single		I	
Univ. of S. Calif. v. Texas Univ.	Single		I	
Arizona Univ. v. Texas Univ..	Single		I	

	KIND	AFF. NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Increased Army and Navy			
Louisiana Coll. v. Ouachita Coll. (Arkansas)	Single		I
Simmons College v. Ouachita Coll.	Single	I	
Univ. of S. Calif. v. Columbia Univ.	Single	I	
La. State Univ., Baylor Univ. (Texas), Southern Methodist Univ. (Tex.)	Triangular	2	I
St. Lawrence Univ. v. Colgate Univ. (N. Y.)	Single	I	
Ohio Wesleyan v. Colgate Univ.	Single	I	
Colgate Univ. v. Rochester Univ. (N. Y.)	Single	I	
Colgate Univ. v. Washington and Jefferson College (Pa.)..	Single	I	
Univ. of Pa. v. Colgate Univ...	Single	I	
Cornell Univ. v. Colgate Univ.	Single	I	
Rochester Univ. v. Ohio Wes- leyan Univ.	Single	I	
Rochester Univ. v. Oberlin Coll. (Ohio)	Single	I	
Increased Army and Navy Forces			
University of Arizona v. Univ. of S. Calif. Law.....	Single	I	
Initiative and Referendum			
Univ. of Mont. v. Univ. of S. Calif.	Single	I	
Intercollegiate Athletics			
Kansas Univ. v. Mo. Univ.	Single	I	
Intervention by the United States for Neutrality of Belgium			
N. Dak. Univ. v. Manitoba.....	Single	I	
Labor Union Exemption			
Fairmount Coll. v. Friends			

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Univ. (Kans.)	Dual	I	I	
Southwestern Coll. (Kans.) v. Kans. Wesleyan Univ.....	Dual		2	
Southwestern Coll. (Kans.) v. Okla. Agri. and Mech. Coll..	Dual		2	
Minimum Wage				
Cornell Coll., Coe Coll., Grinnell Coll. (Iowa).....	Triangular	I	I	I
Lawrence Coll. (Wis.) v. Cornell Coll. (Iowa).....	Single	I		
Fairmount Coll., Ottawa Univ., Emporia Coll. (Kans.) Women	Triangular	2	I	
Mich. S. N. v. Albion Coll.....	Single		I	
Gustavus Adolphus Coll. v. Hamline Univ. (Minn.).....	Dual	I	I	
Lawrence Coll. (Wis.) v. Gustavus Adolphus Coll.	Single	I		
Luther Coll. (Ia.) v. Gustavus Adolphus Coll.	Single		I	
Macalester Coll., Hamline Coll. (Minn.), Coe Coll. (Ia.).....	Triangular			I
Kearney N., Hastings Coll. Grand Island Coll. (Nebr.)....	Triangular	I	2	
Jamestown Coll. v. Fargo Coll. (N. Dakota)	Dual		2	
N. Dak. Univ. v. Fargo Coll....	Single		I	
Trinity, Southwestern, Texas Christian Univ. (Texas)....	Triangular	I	I	I
Carleton Coll. (Minn.) v. Knox Coll. (Ill.)	Dual	I	I	
Monroe Doctrine				
Augustana Coll., Monmouth Coll., Illinois Coll. (Ill.).....	Triangular	I	2	
Kans. S. Agri. Coll. v. Washburn Coll. (Women).....	Dual	I	I	

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Baker Univ., Emporia Coll., Kans. State Agri. Coll., Ot- tawa Univ. and Washburn Coll.	Pentangular	4	5	I
Tulane Univ. (La.) v. Ala. Poly.	Single		1	
Tulane Univ. v. Florida Univ...	Single		1	
Brigham Young Coll. v. Univ. of Nevada	Single	1		
Denison Univ. v. Univ. of Woos- ter (Ohio)	Dual	2		
Marietta Coll. v. Denison Univ.	Dual	1	1	
Univ. of Utah, Utah Agri. Coll., Brigham Young Coll.....	Triangular		2	I
Randolph-Macon Coll. v. Wil- liam & Mary Coll. (Va.).....	Dual	1	1	
William & Mary v. Roanoke Coll. (Va.)	Single		1	
Navy Equal to Any				
Iowa Teachers' Coll. v. Coe Coll. (Women)	Dual		2	
Navy Above Third				
Leland Stanford, Univ. of Wash. and Univ. of Ore.....	Triangular		2	I
Univ. of Montana v. Univ. of Ore.	Single			I
Open Door Policy				
Kans. State Agri. Coll. v. Kans. State Normal	Dual		2	
Peace, International Police Force				
Trinity Coll. (N. C.) v. Swarth- more Coll. (Pa.).....	Single	1		
Juniata Coll. v. Swarthmore (Pa.)	Single	1		
Juniata College v. Univ. of Pittsburgh	Single	1		
Bucknell Univ. v. Lafayette Coll. (Pa.)	Dual	1	1	

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Bucknell Univ. v. Penn. State..	Dual	2		
Dickinson Coll., Franklin & Marshall, Penn. State, and Swarthmore (Pa.)	Quadrangular	2		2
Dickinson Coll. v. Univ. of Pittsburgh	Single			1
Philippines, Independence for				
Highland Park Coll. v. Iowa Teachers' Coll. (Ia.)	Dual	2		
Iowa Univ. v. Northwestern Univ. (Ill.)	Single	1		
Kans., Colo., and Okla. univer- sities	Triangular	2		1
Harvard, Yale, Princeton (Freshmen)	Triangular	3		
Denison, Muskingum, Ohio Univ. (Women)	Triangular	2		1
Virginia Mil. Inst. v. Emory & Henry	Single	1		
Preparedness, Stronger Military				
Carthage Coll., Hedding Coll., Wm. & Vashti Coll. (Ill.)...	Triangular	1	2	
Okla. A. & M. Coll. v. Phillips Univ.	Single		1	
Preparedness, Administration plan				
Hillsdale Coll., Albion Coll. (Mich.)	Single		1	
Mich. State Normal v. Ferris Inst.	Dual	1	1	
Kearney v. Peru (Nebr. Nor- mals)	Dual	1	1	
Cornell Univ. v. Syracuse Univ. (N. Y.)	Single	1		
Trinity Coll. (N. C.), Wash. & Lee (Va.)	Single	1		

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Syracuse Univ. v. Penn. Univ. Single		I		
Charleston Coll., Clemson Coll., Wofford Coll. (S. C.).....	Triangular		2	I
Richmond Coll. v. Randolph- Macon (Va.)	Single	I		
Preparedness, Garrison's plan				
Bowdoin, Wesleyan, Hamilton.	Triangular	I	2	
Prohibition				
Emory & Henry v. Hampden- Sidney (Va.)	Single	I		
Rural Credits				
Ala. Poly., Univ. of Ga., N. C. Agri. Coll.	Triangular	I	I	I
Ship Subsidy				
Richmond Coll. (Va.), Wake Forest (N. C.).....	Dual	I	I	
Univ. of Ga., Univ. of Tenn., Univ. of S. Car.	Triangular	I	I	I
Short Ballot				
S. Dak. Agri. Coll. v. Mont. State Coll.	Single		I	
Single Tax				
Penn Coll. v. Parsons Coll. (Iowa)	Dual		I	I
Upper Iowa v. Iowa Wesleyan	Dual		2	
Baldwin-Wallace Univ., Hiram Coll., Heidelberg Univ. (Ohio)	Triangular	2	I	
Heidelberg Univ. v. Univ. of Detroit	Single		I	
Heidelberg Univ. v. Earlham Coll. (Ind.)	Single	I		
Socialism				
S. Dak. Wesleyan, Huron Col- lege, Yankton Coll. (S. Dak.)	Triangular		3	
Oshkosh Normal, Stevens Point Normal	Single		I	

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DE- CISION
Oshkosh Normal, Indiana and Illinois State Normals.....	Triangular	I	I	I
Tariff, Federal Commission				
Whittier Coll. (Cal.) v. Univ. of S. Calif.	Dual	I	I	
Tariff, Protective				
Agricultural divisions of Univs. of Minn., Wis., and Ia. State Coll.	Triangular	2	I	
Tax Exemption, Personal Prop- erty				
Albion Coll. (Mich.) v. Earl- ham Coll. (Ind.).....	Single		I	
Trusts, Interstate Trade Commis- sion for				
Univ. of N. Mex. v. Univ. of S. Calif. Law	Single	I		
Iowa Teachers' Coll. v. Simpson Coll. (Ia.)	Dual	I	I	
Trusts, Federal Charter and In- terstate Trade Commission for				
Univ. of Nevada v. Coll. of Pa- cific (Calif.)	Single	I		
Unicameral Legislature				
Pomona Coll. v. Whittier Coll. (Calif.)	Dual	I	I	
Univ. of Redlands v. Pomona Coll. (Cal.)	Single	I		
Occidental Coll. v. Univ. of Redlands	Single	I		
Bethel Coll., Friends Univ., Cooper Coll. (Kansas).....	Triangular	I	I	I
Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws				
Washington State Coll. v. Idaho Univ.	Dual	I	I	

APPENDIX III

SUMMARY OF ANNUAL DEBATE RECORDS, 1910-1916

ALABAMA

Alabama Polytechnic. Auburn.

Versus Univ. of Georgia.

1915. At Athens, Georgia Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Auburn. No report.

Versus N. Carolina Agri. Coll.

1915. At Auburn. No report.

1916. At Athens, Ga., N. Car. Neg. won.

At W. Raleigh, N. Car. Aff. won.

Versus Tulane Univ.

1915. At Auburn, Tulane Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At New Orleans, Tulane Neg. 3.

Southern University. Greensboro.

Versus Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.

1911. Millsaps won.

Spring Hill College. Mobile.

Versus Jesuits College, New Orleans.

1912. Jesuits College Aff. won.

Talladega College. Talladega.

Versus Atlanta Baptist College, Ga.

Previous to 1911 number of debates won 4 to 4.

1911. Talladega won.

1912. At Atlanta, Atlanta Aff. won.

1913. At Talladega, Atlanta Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Knoxville College, Tenn.

Previous to 1911 Knoxville 2, Talladega 0.

1911. At Knoxville, Knoxville 2 to 1.

1912. At Talladega, Talladega Aff. won.

1913. At Knoxville, Talladega Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Talladega, Knoxville Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. No report.

1916. At Talladega, Talladega Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga.

1914. At Atlanta, Talladega Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. No report.

1916. At Atlanta, Morehouse Aff. 2 to 1.

University of Alabama. Tuscaloosa.

Versus Univ. of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.

1912. At Tuscaloosa. Decision not reported.

1913. At Sewanee, Ala. Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. No report.

Versus Vanderbilt University, Tenn.

1913. At Tuscaloosa, Alabama Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Nashville, Vanderbilt Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Tuscaloosa, Ala. Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. No report.

Versus Kentucky University.

1915. At Lexington, Ala. Neg. 2 to 1.

ARIZONA

Arizona University. Tucson.

Versus Univ. of S. California Law School.

1916. At Los Angeles, Arizona Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Texas.

1916. At Tucson, Texas Neg. 2 to 1.

ARKANSAS

Hendrix College. Conway.

Versus Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.

1912. At Conway, Hendrix Neg. won.

At Jackson, Hendrix Aff. won.

Versus Central College, Fayette, Mo.

1915. At Fayette, Central Aff. 2 to 1.

Ouachita College. Arkadelphia.

Versus Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

1913. At Waco, Ouachita Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Arkadelphia, Ouachita Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Centenary College, Shreveport, La.

1915. At Shreveport, Ouachita Aff. 3 to 0.
 Versus Union College, Jackson, Tenn.
1915. At Arkadelphia, Ouachita Neg. 2 to 1.
 Versus Louisiana Coll.
1916. At Arkadelphia, Ouachita Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Simmons Coll.
1916. At Abilene, Texas, Simmons Aff. 2 to 1.
- University of Arkansas. Fayetteville.**
- Versus William Jewell Coll., Liberty, Mo.
1910. At Fayetteville, Wm. Jewell Neg. 3 to 0.
1911. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
1911. Arkansas won.
1912. Did not meet in pentangular.
1913. At Fayetteville, Arkansas Aff. 2 to 1.
1914. At Fayetteville, Arkansas Aff. 2 to 1.
 Versus Mississippi University.
1912. No report.
- Versus Univ. of Texas, Austin.
1912. Texas won.
1914. At Austin, Texas Aff. 2 to 1.
1915. At Fayetteville, Arkansas Aff. 2 to 1.
1916. At Austin, Texas Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus University of Louisiana.
1913. At Baton Rouge, Louisiana Aff. 2 to 1.
1915. At Baton Rouge, Louisiana Aff. 2 to 1.
 Versus Univ. of Oklahoma, Norman.
1914. At Fayetteville, Arkansas Neg. 3 to 0.
1915. At Norman, Arkansas Neg. 2 to 1.
1916. No report.

CALIFORNIA

Leland Stanford University. Palo Alto.

Versus Univ. of California.

Annual debates for about 20 yrs. preceding this record.

1911. At Palo Alto, Univ. of Calif. Aff. 2 to 1.
1912. At Berkeley, Stanford Neg. 3 to 1.
1913. At San Francisco, Stanford Aff. 3 to 0.
1914. At San Francisco, Univ. of Calif. Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At San Francisco, Stanford Aff. 2 to 1.

The Carnot Debates.

1913. At Palo Alto. Won by J. J. Miller, Univ. of Cal.

1914. At Berkeley. Won by John Levy, Univ. of Cal.

1915. At Palo Alto. Won by J. F. Elden, Jr., Stanford.

1916. At Berkeley. Won by Cohen, Univ. of Cal. S. W.

Grathwell, Stanford, 2nd prize.

Versus Univ. of Oregon, Eugene.

1911. Oregon 2 to 1.

1912. Stanford Neg. won.

1913. At Palo Alto, Oregon Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Eugene, Stanford Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Palo Alto, Stanford Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Eugene, Stanford Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Washington, Seattle.

1911. At Seattle, Washington 3 to 0.

1912. At Palo Alto, Washington Neg. won.

1913. At Seattle, Washington Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Palo Alto, Washington Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Seattle, Stanford Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Palo Alto, Washington Neg. 2 to 1.

Occidental College. Los Angeles.

Versus Pomona College, Claremont.

1911. At Occidental, Occidental won.

1912. At Claremont, Pomona Aff. won.

1913. At Occidental, Occidental Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Claremont, Pomona Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Occidental, Pomona Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Claremont, Pomona Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of So. California, Los Angeles.

1911. At Univ. of S. Calif., U. of S. C. won.

1912. At Occidental, Occidental Aff. won.

1913. At U. S. C., U. S. C. Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Occidental, U. S. C. Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At U. S. C., Occidental Neg. 2 to 1. (Women's
Deb. U. S. C. Neg. 2 to 1.)

1916. At Occidental, Occidental Aff. won.

Versus University of Redlands, Redlands.

1912. At Redlands, Redlands Neg. won.

- 1913. At Occidental, Occidental Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1914. At Redlands, Occidental Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Occidental (Women), Occidental Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Whittier College, Whittier.

- 1914. At Occidental, Occidental won.
- 1915. At Whittier, Occidental Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Southwestern College of Law, Los Angeles.

- 1916. Southwestern Coll. won.

Pomona College.

Versus Occidental College. (See Occidental above.)

- 1908. At Claremont, Pomona Neg. won.
- 1909. At Occidental, Occidental Aff. won.
- 1910. At Claremont, Occidental Aff. won.

For rest of report see Occidental above.

Versus Univ. of So. California, Los Angeles.

- 1912. At U. S. C., Pomona Neg. won.
- 1913. At Claremont, Pomona Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At U. S. C., Pomona Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Claremont, U. S. C. Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At U. S. C., Pomona Neg. 2 to 1.

Freshmen Debates.

- 1915. At Claremont, U. S. C. Neg. 3 to 0.
At U. S. C., Pomona Neg. 2 to 1.

- 1916. At Claremont, Pomona Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Redlands, Redlands.

- 1914. (Freshmen.) At Redlands, Redlands Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Claremont, Pomona Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Redlands, Redlands Neg. 2 to 1.

Women's Debate.

- 1916. At Redlands, Redlands Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Whittier College, Whittier.

- 1916. At Claremont, Pomona Aff. 3 to 0.
At Whittier, Pomona Neg. 2 to 1.

University of California. Berkeley.

Versus Stanford Univ. (See Stanford above.)

University of Redlands. Redlands.

Versus University of So. California Law School.

- 1910. U. S. C. Neg. won.
- 1911. U. S. C. Neg. won.

Versus University of S. California (Freshmen).

1915. At Redlands, U. S. C. Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Occidental College. (See Occidental above.)

Versus Pomona College. (See Pomona above.)

Versus Whittier College, Whittier.

1913. At Redlands, Whittier Neg. 2 to 1.

At Whittier, Redlands Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Throop College of Technology.

1916. At Redlands, Redlands Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of N. Mexico, Albuquerque.

1916. At Albuquerque, Redlands Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans.

1916. At Winfield, Southwestern Aff. 3 to 0.

Throop College of Technology. Pasadena.

Versus Univ. of S. California. (Freshmen.)

1915. At Pasadena, U. S. C. Freshmen Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Redlands, Redlands.

1916. At Redlands, Redlands Neg. 3 to 0.

University of So. California. Los Angeles.

Versus Occidental College. (See Occidental above.)

Versus Pomona College. (See Pomona above.)

Versus Univ. of Redlands. (See Redlands above.)

Versus Throop College. (See Throop above.)

Versus Whittier College.

1914. At Whittier, U. S. C. Neg. 3 to 0.

At Los Angeles, Whittier Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. No report.

Versus University of Oklahoma, Norman.

1914. At Norman, U. S. C. Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Stanford University, Palo Alto.

1916. At Los Angeles, Leland Stanford Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Texas, Austin.

1916. At Los Angeles, Texas Neg. 3 to 0.

University of So. Calif. Law School.

Versus Northwestern College of Law, Evanston, Ill.

1913. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. Neg. 3 to 0.

At Northwestern, Evanston, U. S. C. 3 to 0.

Versus Drake University, Des Moines, Ia.

1913. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. Neg. 3 to 0.
At Des Moines, U. S. C. Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Brigham Young Univ., Utah.
1914. At Salt Lake City, Brigham Young Neg. 2 to 1.
1915. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. 2 to 1.
Versus North Dakota Agri. Coll., Fargo.
1914. At Los Angeles, N. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.
1915. At Fargo, N. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Univ. of Arizona, Tucson.
1916. At Los Angeles, Arizona Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Univ. of Montana, Missoula, Mont.
1916. At Los Angeles, Montana Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus University of Denver, Denver, Colo.
1916. At Denver, U. S. C. Neg. 3 to 0.
Versus Columbia University, New York.
1916. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. Aff. 3 to 0.
Versus Univ. of N. Mexico, Albuquerque.
1916. At Albuquerque, Univ. of N. Mex. Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Whittier College, Whittier, Cal.
1915. No report.
1916. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. Aff. 3 to 0.
At Whittier, U. S. C. Neg. 2 to 1.
Whittier College. Whittier.
Versus Occidental. (See Occidental above.)
Versus Pomona College. (See Pomona above.)
Versus Univ. of Redlands. (See Redlands above.)
Versus University of S. California and the Law School.
(See Univ. of So. Calif. above.)
College of the Pacific. San José.
Versus Univ. of Nevada, Reno.
1916. At San José, Univ. of Nev. Aff. 2 to 1.

COLORADO

- Colorado Agricultural College. Ft. Collins.**
Versus Kansas Agricultural College, Manhattan.
1913. At Ft. Collins, Kansas Agri. Neg. on grades.
1914. At Manhattan, Kansas Agri. Aff. won.
1915. At Ft. Collins, Colorado Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater.

1913. At Stillwater, Okla. Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Ft. Collins, Colo. Aff. won.

1915. At Stillwater, Okla. Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Wyoming, Laramie.

1915. At Laramie, Wyoming Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Ft. Collins, Colo. Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Denver, Denver.

1916. At Denver, Denver Aff. 2 to 1.

Colorado College. Colorado Springs.

Versus Univ. of Denver, Denver.

1909. At Colorado Springs, Denver Univ. 2 to 1.

1910. At Denver, Denver Univ. 3 to 0.

1911. At Colorado Springs, Colorado Coll. 3 to 0.

1912. At Denver, Colorado Coll. Neg. won.

1913. At Colorado Springs, Colo. Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Denver, Denver Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Colorado Springs, Denver Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Denver, Denver Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Wm. Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.

1915. At Liberty, Colo. Coll. Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Colorado Springs, Colo. Coll. Neg. 2 to 1.

University of Colorado. Boulder.

Versus Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence.

1911. Colorado won 2 to 1.

1912. Colorado Neg. won.

1913. At Boulder, Colo. Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Lawrence, Kansas Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Boulder, Kans. Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Oklahoma University, Norman.

1911. At Norman, Colo. 2 to 1.

1912. At Boulder, Oklahoma won.

1913. At Norman, Colo. Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Boulder, Okla. Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Norman. No report.

1916. At Boulder. No report.

Versus Univ. of S. Dakota, Vermillion.

1911. At Vermillion, S. Dak. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake.

1912. At Boulder, Colo. Univ. won.

- 1913. At Salt Lake, Colo. Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1914. At Boulder, Colo. Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Salt Lake, Utah Aff. 2 to 1.
- Versus University of Missouri, Columbia.

- 1912. Colo. Neg. won.
- 1913. At Boulder, Mo. Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Columbia. No report.
- 1915. At Boulder. No report.
- 1916. At Columbia. No report.

Versus University of Texas, Austin.

- 1913. At Austin, Colo. Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Boulder, Colo. Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Austin, Colo. Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Boulder, Texas Neg. 3 to 0.

University of Denver. Denver.

Versus Colorado College, Colorado Springs. (See Colorado Coll. above.)

Versus Washburn College, Topeka, Kans.

- 1910. At Denver, Denver 2 to 1.
- 1911. At Topeka, Washburn Coll. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake.

- 1911. At Denver, Utah 3 to 0.
- 1912. At Salt Lake, Denver Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of S. Dakota, Vermillion.

- 1911. At Denver, S. Dak. 2 to 1.
- 1912. At Vermillion, S. Dak. won.

Versus Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.

- 1913. At Ottawa, Ottawa Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Wm. Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.

- 1913. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Wyoming, Laramie.

- 1913. At Denver. Decision not reported.
- 1914. At Laramie, Wyoming Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Denver, Wyoming Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Laramie, Denver Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina.

- 1914. At Salina, Kansas Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Denver, Kansas Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of So. Calif. Law School, Los Angeles, Cal.

1915. At Los Angeles, Cal., U. S. C. Law 3 to 0.
1916. At Denver, U. S. C. Law 3 to 0.
Versus Colo. Agri. College. (See Colo. Agri. Coll. above.)

CONNECTICUT

Trinity College. Hartford.

Versus New York University, New York City.

1915. At Hartford, New York Univ. Neg. 2 to 1.
1916. At New York City, Trinity Neg. 2 to 1.
Versus Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

1915. At New Brunswick. No report.
1916. At Hartford, Rutgers Neg. 3 to 0.

Wesleyan University. Middletown, Conn.

Versus Williams College, Mass.

1900. At Williamstown, Williams won.
1901. At Middletown, Wesleyan won.
1902. At Williamstown, Williams won.
1903. At Middletown, Wesleyan won.
1904. At Williamstown, Wesleyan won.
1905. At Middletown, Wesleyan won.
1906. At Williamstown, Wesleyan won.
1907. At Middletown, Wesleyan won.
1908. At Williamstown, Williams won.
1909-10. No report.
1911. At Middletown, Williams Neg. won.
1912. No report.
1913. At Williamstown, Williams Aff. 2 to 1.
1914. No report.
1915. No report.
1916. No report.

Versus Amherst College, Mass.

1906. At Middletown, Amherst won.
1907. At Amherst, Wesleyan won.
1908. At Middletown, Wesleyan won.
1909-10. No report.
1911. At Amherst, Wesleyan Aff. won.
1912. No report.
1913. At Middletown, Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.

- 1911. Wesleyan Neg. won.
- 1912. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Neg. won.
- 1913. At Middletown, Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1914. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Middletown, Wesleyan Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1916. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus New York University, New York City.

- 1911. New York Univ. Neg. won.

Versus Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

- 1913. At Hamilton, Hamilton Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Middletown, Wesleyan Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Hamilton, Hamilton Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Middletown, Hamilton Aff. 3 to 0.

Yale University. New Haven.

Versus Harvard University.

- 1910. At New Haven, Harvard Aff. won.
- 1911. At Cambridge. No report.
- 1912. At New Haven, Yale Neg. won.
(Freshmen.) No report.
- 1913. At Cambridge, Harvard Neg. 3 to 0.
(Freshmen.) At New Haven, Harvard Aff. won.
- 1914. At New Haven, Yale Neg. won.
(Freshmen.) No report.
- 1915. At New Haven, Yale Neg. 3 to 0.
(Freshmen.) At New Haven, Yale Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1916. At New Haven, Harvard Aff. 3 to 0.
(Freshmen.) At Cambridge, Harvard Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Princeton University.

- 1910. At Princeton, Yale Aff. won.
- 1911. No report.
- 1912. At New Haven, Princeton Neg. won.
(Freshmen.) Princeton won.
- 1913. At New Haven, Princeton Aff. 2 to 1.
(Freshmen.) At Princeton, Princeton Neg. won.
- 1914. At Princeton, Princeton Neg. won.
(Freshmen.) No report.
- 1915. At Princeton, Yale Neg. 3 to 0.
(Freshmen.) At Princeton, Princeton Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Princeton, Princeton 3 to 0.

1916. (Freshmen.) At New Haven, Yale Neg. 3 to 0.
Versus Syracuse University.

1912. At New Haven, Yale Aff. 2 to 1.

At Syracuse, Syracuse Aff. 2 to 1.

1913. At Syracuse, Syracuse Aff. 3 to 0.

At New Haven, Syracuse Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At New Haven, Yale Neg. 3 to 0.

(Freshmen.) At Syracuse, Syracuse Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Syracuse, Syracuse Aff. 2 to 1.

At New Haven, Syracuse Neg. 3 to 0.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Georgetown University. Washington.

Versus Boston College.

1910. Boston won.

1911. Boston won.

1915. At Washington, Georgetown Neg. 5 to 0.

1916. At Washington, Boston Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Cornell University.

1913. At Washington, Georgetown Neg. 3 to 0.

George Washington University.

Versus Washington and Lee.

1912. At Washington, George Washington won.

At Lexington, George Washington won.

1913. At Washington, Va., George Washington Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

1914. Cornell Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of N. Carolina. (See under N. Carolina.)

Howard University. Washington.

Versus Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.

1910. Howard won.

1911. Howard won.

1914. At Washington, D. C., Howard Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Nashville, Howard Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.

1910. Howard won.

1911. Howard won.

1915. At Washington, Howard Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Wilberforce Univ., Wilberforce, Ohio.

1914. At Wilberforce, Wilberforce Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus College Men's Round Table, New York City.

1915. At New York City, College Men Neg. 2 to 1.

FLORIDA

University of Florida. Gainesville.

Versus Tulane University, New Orleans, La.

1916. At Gainesville, Florida Neg. 3 to 0.

GEORGIA

Atlanta University. Atlanta.

Versus Howard Univ., Washington, D. C.

1910. Howard won.

1911. Howard won.

1915. At Washington, Howard Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Fisk Univ., Nashville, Tenn.

1910-11. No report.

1913. At Atlanta, Fisk Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Nashville, Atlanta Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Atlanta, Atlanta Aff. 3 to 0.

Atlanta Baptist. Atlanta.

Versus Talladega College, Alabama. (See under Alabama.)

Versus Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.

1911. No report.

1912. Knoxville Aff. won.

1913. At Atlanta, Knoxville Neg. 3 to 0.

Clark University. Atlanta.

Versus Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

Emory College. Oxford.

Versus Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va.

1912. Emory and Henry Neg. won.

1913. At Spartanburg, S. Car., Emory (Ga.) Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Oxford, Emory (Ga.) Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. Carolina.

1914. At Spartanburg, Emory Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Davidson College, Davidson, N. Carolina.

1915. At Decatur, Ga., Davidson Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Decatur, Ga., Davidson Aff. 4 to 1.
Versus Furman University, Greenville, S. Carolina.
1915. At Oxford, Ga., Emory Aff. 2 to 1.

Mercer University. Macon.

- Versus Baylor University, Waco, Texas.
1915. At Macon, Baylor Aff. 3 to 0.
Versus Furman Univ., Greenville, S. Car.
1915. At Macon, Furman Univ. 3 to 0.

Morehouse College. Atlanta.

- Versus Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.
1914. At Atlanta, Talladega Neg. 2 to 1.
1915. No report.
1916. At Atlanta, Morehouse Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Knoxville College, Tenn.
1914. At Knoxville, Morehouse Neg. 3 to 0.
1915. No report.
1916. At Knoxville, Knoxville Aff. 3 to 0.

University of Georgia. Athens.

- Versus Univ. of N. Carolina, Chapel Hill. (See under N. Carolina.)

Previous to 1911 Ga. won four and lost five.

1911. N. Carolina won.
Versus Tulane University, New Orleans.
1911. Tulane won.
1913. At New Orleans, Tulane Aff. 3 to 0.
Versus Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn.
Previous to 1911 won one and lost one.
1912. At Athens, Vanderbilt Neg. won.
Versus University of Virginia, Charlottesville.
Previous to 1911 won one from Virginia.
1912. At Charlottesville, Ga. Neg. won.
1914. At Columbia, S. Car., Ga. Neg. 4 to 1.
Versus Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
1913. At Athens, Ga. Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Univ. of S. Carolina, Columbia.
1914. At Charlottesville, Va., Ga. Aff. 3 to 2.
1915. At Knoxville, Tenn., S. Car. Neg. 3 to 0.
1916. At Knoxville. No report.
Versus Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville.

1915. At Columbia, Tennessee Aff. 2 to 1.
 1916. At Columbia, S. Car., Ga. Aff. 3 to 2.
 Versus Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn.
 1915. At Athens, Ga. Aff. 2 to 1.
 1916. At Auburn. No report.
 Versus North Carolina Agri. College, West Raleigh.
 1915. At West Raleigh, Ga. Neg. 3 to 0.
 1916. At West Raleigh, N. C. Agri. Aff. 3 to 0.

IDAHO

University of Idaho. Moscow.

Versus Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.

1912. Idaho Aff. won.

Versus Williamette University, Salem, Ore.

1913. At Salem, Idaho Neg. 3 to 0.

At Moscow, Williamette Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.

1913. At Moscow, Idaho Univ. 3 to 0.

At Spokane, Gonzaga 3 to 0.

1914. At Moscow, Gonzaga 2 to 1.

At Spokane, Gonzaga 3 to 0.

1915. At Spokane, Gonzaga Aff. 2 to 1.

At Moscow, Idaho Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Spokane, Idaho Neg. 3 to 0.

At Moscow, Idaho Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Utah Agri. College, Logan.

1915. At Logan, Idaho Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Moscow, Idaho Aff. 1 to 0.

At Logan. No report.

Versus Montana State College, Bozeman.

1916. At Bozeman, Montana Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Montana, Missoula. (See under Montana.)

ILLINOIS

Augustana College. Rock Island.

Versus Lombard College, Galesburg, Ill.

1911. At Galesburg, Augustana Aff. 2 to 1.

1912. At Rock Island, Augustana Neg. won.

Versus Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas.

1912. Augustana won.
1913. At Rock Island, Bethany Aff. 2 to 1.
1914. At Lindsborg, Bethany Aff. 2 to 1.
- Versus Northwestern College, Naperville, Ill.
1913. At Naperville, Northwestern Aff. 2 to 1.
- Versus Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.
1913. At Rock Island, Carroll Neg. 3 to 0.
- Versus Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.
1914. At Monmouth, Monmouth Aff. 2 to 1.
1915. At Rock Island, Monmouth Neg. 3 to 0.
1916. At Monmouth, Monmouth Aff. 2 to 1.
- Versus Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
1914. At Rock Island, Illinois Neg. 2 to 1.
1915. At Jacksonville, Illinois Aff. 2 to 1.
1916. At Rock Island, Illinois Neg. 2 to 1.
- Versus Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill.
1916. At Rock Island, Augustana Neg. 3 to 0.
- Bradley Polytechnic Institute.** Peoria.
- Versus Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.
1916. At Rock Island, Augustana Neg. 3 to 0.
- Versus Illinois Coll., Jacksonville, Ill.
1914. At Jacksonville, Ill. Coll. Aff. 3 to 0.
- Carthage College,** Carthage.
- Versus Christian University, Canton, Mo.
1911. Carthage Aff. won.
- Versus Hedding College, Abingdon, Ill.
1911. Carthage Aff. won.
1915. At Abingdon, Hedding Aff. 3 to 0.
1916. At Carthage, Hedding Neg. 2 to 1.
- Versus William and Vashti, Aledo, Ill.
1915. At Carthage, Wm. and Vashti Neg. 2 to 1.
1916. At Aledo, Wm. and Vashti Aff. 2 to 1.
- Eureka College.** Eureka.
- Versus Illinois Wesleyan College, Bloomington.
1913. At Bloomington, Ill. Wesleyan Aff. 2 to 1.
1914. At Eureka, Eureka Aff. 2 to 1.
1915. At Bloomington, Eureka Neg. 2 to 1.
1916. No report.
- Versus James Milliken University, Decatur, Ill.

- 1913. At Eureka, Eureka Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Decatur, Eureka Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Eureka, Eureka Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1916. No report.

Hedding College. Abingdon.

Versus Carthage College. (See Carthage above.)

Versus William and Vashti Coll., Aledo, Ill.

- 1915. At Aledo, Wm. and Vashti Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Abingdon, Wm. and Vashti Neg. 2 to 1.

Illinois College. Jacksonville.

Versus Illinois Wesleyan, Bloomington.

- 1911. Illinois Coll. won 2 to 1.

Versus James Milliken, Decatur, Ill.

- 1911. James Milliken won 2 to 1.

Versus Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill.

- 1914. At Jacksonville, Illinois Coll. Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Augustana College, Rock Island. (See Augustana above.)

Versus Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.

- 1914. At Jacksonville, Illinois Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Monmouth, Monmouth Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1916. At Jacksonville, Monmouth Neg. 3 to 0.

Illinois State Normal. Normal.

Versus Indiana State Normal, Terre Haute.

- 1913. At Normal, Indiana Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1914. At Terre Haute, Indiana Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. No report.
- 1916. No report.

Versus Oshkosh Normal, Wis.

- 1913. At Oshkosh, Oshkosh Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Normal, Oshkosh Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1915. No report.
- 1916. At Normal, Oshkosh Neg. 2 to 1.

Illinois Wesleyan University. Bloomington.

Versus Iowa Wesleyan Univ., Mt. Pleasant, Ia.

- 1910. Illinois Wesleyan won.
- 1911. Illinois Wesleyan won.

Versus Illinois College. (See Illinois College above.)

Versus Northwestern College, Naperville, Ill.

1910. Illinois Wesleyan won.

1911. Northwestern College won.

1912. Illinois Wesleyan won.

Versus James Milliken University, Decatur, Ill.

1911. Illinois Wesleyan won.

1912. No report.

1913. At Decatur, Milliken Aff. won 2 to 1.

1914. At Bloomington, Milliken Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Decatur. No report.

1916. At Bloomington. No report.

Versus Eureka College. (See Eureka Coll. above.)

James Milliken University. Decatur.

Versus Eureka College. (See Eureka above.)

Versus Illinois College. (See Illinois Coll. above.)

Versus Illinois Wesleyan Univ. (See Ill. Wesleyan above.)

Knox College. Galesburg.

Versus Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

1897. At Galesburg, Beloit Neg. 2 to 1.

1898. At Galesburg, Beloit Neg. 2 to 1.

1899. At Beloit, Beloit Neg. 2 to 1.

1900. At Beloit, Knox. Neg. 3 to 0.

1901. At Galesburg, Knox Aff. 3 to 0.

1902. At Beloit, Beloit Neg. 2 to 1.

1903. At Galesburg, Beloit Neg. 2 to 1.

1904. At Beloit, Knox Aff. 2 to 1.

1905. At Galesburg, Beloit Neg. 3 to 0.

1906. At Beloit, Knox Neg. 2 to 1.

1907. At Galesburg, Knox Aff. 2 to 1.

1908. At Beloit, Beloit Neg. 3 to 0.

1909. At Galesburg, Knox Neg. 2 to 1.

1910. At Beloit, Knox Neg. 2 to 1.

1911. At Galesburg, Beloit Neg. 2 to 1.

1912. No report. (Triangular began here.)

1913. At Galesburg, Beloit Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Beloit, Beloit Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Galesburg, Beloit Neg. 1 to 0. (Cornell
dropped out of triangular.)

At Beloit, Beloit Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. No report.

Versus James Milliken Univ., Decatur, Ill.

1913. (Freshmen.) At Decatur, Knox Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia.

1912. Cornell Aff. won.

1913. At Mt. Vernon, Knox Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Galesburg, Knox Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Iowa Wesleyan Univ., Mt. Pleasant.

1914. (Freshmen Dual.) At Galesburg, Ia. Wesleyan
2 to 1.

At Mt. Pleasant, Ia. Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Monmouth College. (See Monmouth below.)

Versus Carleton Coll., Northfield, Minn. (See under Minn.)

Lombard College. Galesburg.

Versus Augustana College. (See Augustana above.)

Monmouth College. Monmouth.

Versus Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.

1910. Monmouth Neg. won. (Sophomore debate.)

1911. Monmouth Aff. won. (Sophomore debate.)

Versus Cornell College, Iowa.

1911. Monmouth Neg. won.

Versus William and Vashti, Aledo, Ill.

1911. William and Vashti won 3 to 0.

Versus William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.

1912. At Liberty, William Jewell Neg. 3 to 0.

1913. At Monmouth, William Jewell Neg. won.

1914. At Monmouth, Monmouth Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Iowa Wesleyan Univ., Mt. Pleasant, Ia.

1912. (Sophomore Debate.) At Monmouth, Monmouth
Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Mt. Pleasant, Monmouth Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Augustana College, Rock Island. (See Augustana
above.)

Versus Illinois College. (See Illinois College above.)

Northwestern College. Naperville.

Versus Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.

1911. At Waukesha, Carroll Aff. won.

1912. At Waukesha, Carroll Aff. 2 to 1.

1913. At Naperville, Northwestern Neg. won.

1914. At Naperville, Northwestern Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Waukesha, Northwestern Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. No debate.

1916. At Waukesha, Northwestern Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Illinois Wesleyan, Bloomington.

1910. Illinois Wesleyan won.

1911. Northwestern Coll. won.

1912. Illinois Wesleyan won.

Versus Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill.

1911. Northwestern Neg. won.

1913. (Freshmen.) Wheaton Aff. won.

Versus Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.

1915. At Ripon, Northwestern Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. Naperville, Northwestern Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia.

1915. At Naperville, Northwestern Neg. 3 to 0.

Northwestern University. Evanston.

Triangular with Universities of Chicago and Michigan
since 1907.

Quadrangular with same institutions and Minnesota
previous to 1907.

Versus University of Chicago.

1911. At Chicago, Chicago won.

Freshmen. Northwestern Neg. won.

1912. At Evanston, Northwestern Aff. won.

Freshmen. No report.

1913. At Chicago, Chicago Aff. 2 to 1.

Freshmen. Northwestern Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Evanston, Northwestern Aff. 3 to 0.

Freshmen. At Chicago, Northwestern Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Chicago. No report.

Freshmen. No report.

1916. At Evanston, Chicago Neg. 2 to 1.

At Chicago, Chicago Neg. 2 to 1. (Freshmen.)

Versus University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

1911. At Evanston, Northwestern won.

1912. At Ann Arbor, Mich. Aff. won.

1913. At Evanston, Northwestern Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Ann Arbor, Northwestern Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Evanston, Northwestern Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Ann Arbor, Michigan Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus University of Iowa, Iowa City.

1916. At Evanston, Ia. Aff. 2 to 1.

University of Chicago. Chicago.

Versus Northwestern. (See Northwestern Univ. above.)

Versus University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

1911. At Ann Arbor, Michigan Aff. won.

1912. At Chicago, Michigan Neg. won.

1913. At Ann Arbor, Michigan Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Chicago, Chicago Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Ann Arbor, Michigan Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Chicago, Chicago Aff. 2 to 1.

University of Illinois. Urbana.

Versus University of Indiana, Bloomington.

1911. Indiana won.

1912. At Bloomington, Indiana Aff. won.

1913. At Urbana, Indiana Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Bloomington, Illinois Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Ohio University, Columbus.

1911. Ohio won.

1912. At Urbana, Ohio Neg. won.

1913. At Columbus, Ohio Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Urbana, Illinois Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln.

1911. Nebraska Neg. won 2 to 1.

1913. At Lincoln, Nebraska Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

1911. Illinois Neg. won 3 to 0.

1913. At Urbana, Minnesota Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Urbana, Minnesota Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Minneapolis, Minnesota Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City.

1912. At Iowa City, Illinois Neg. won.

1914. At Urbana, Iowa Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Iowa City, 2 to 1, winner not designated.

1916. At Urbana, Illinois Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison.

1912. At Urbana, Illinois Aff. won.

1914. At Madison, Wisconsin Aff. won 3 to 0.

1915. At Urbana. No report.

1916. At Madison, Illinois Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

1915. At Ann Arbor, Illinois Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Urbana, Michigan Neg. 3 to 0.

Wheaton College. Wheaton.

Versus Northwestern College, Naperville. (See Northwestern above.)

Versus Chicago Teachers' College.

1912. Wheaton Aff. won.

William and Vashti College. Aledo.

Versus Monmouth College. (See Monmouth above.)

Versus Carthage College. (See Carthage above.)

Versus Hedding College. (See Hedding above.)

INDIANA

Butler College. Irvington, Indianapolis.

Versus Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

1911. At Indianapolis, Butler Aff. 3 to 0.

At Oxford, Miami Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Albion College, Albion, Mich.

1912. At Indianapolis, Albion Aff. won.

1913. At Albion, Mich., Albion Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Indianapolis, Albion Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.

1913. At Indianapolis, Butler Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.

1915. At Indianapolis, Butler Aff. 2 to 1.

DePauw University. Greencastle.

Versus Indiana University, Bloomington.

1911. At Greencastle, Indiana Univ. Neg. won 2 to 1.

1912. At Greencastle, DePauw Aff. won.

At Bloomington, Indiana Aff. won.

1913. At Greencastle, Indiana Univ. Neg. 2 to 1.

At Bloomington, Indiana Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Richmond, Ind. No report.

Versus Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.

1911. At Crawfordsville, DePauw Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Albion College, Albion, Mich.

1911. At Greencastle, Albion won.

At Albion, Albion won.

Versus Earlham College, Ind. (See Earlham Coll. below.)

Earlham College. Richmond.

Versus Albion College, Mich.

1911. At Richmond, Albion Neg. won.

1912. At Albion, Earlham Neg. won.

1913. At Richmond, Earlham Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Albion, Albion Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. No report.

1916. At Albion, Earlham Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Cincinnati, Ohio.

1912. At Richmond, Cincinnati Neg. won.

1913. At Cincinnati, Earlham Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Butler College, Indianapolis, Ind. (See Butler above.)

Versus DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

1914. At Bloomington, Earlham Neg. won.

1916. Held Exhibition debates at high schools — no decision.

Versus Indiana University, Bloomington.

1914. At Greencastle, Indiana Neg. won.

1916. Exhibition debates at high schools, no decision.

Versus Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.

1915. At Crawfordsville, Earlham Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Heidelberg Univ., Tiffin, Ohio.

1916. At Richmond, Heidelberg Aff. 2 to 1.

Indiana University. Bloomington.

Versus University of Illinois. (See Illinois — Univ. of Ill.)

Versus Univ. of Ohio, Columbus.

1911-12. No report.

1913. At Bloomington, Ohio Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Columbus, Ohio State Aff. won.

1915. At Bloomington, Ohio State Neg. 3 to 0.

At Columbus, Ohio State Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus DePauw University, Greencastle. (See DePauw, Indiana, above.)

Versus Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.

1911. At Bloomington, Indiana Aff. won.

1912. At Crawfordsville, Wabash won.

1913. At Bloomington, Indiana Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.

1912. At Bloomington, Notre Dame won.

1913. At Notre Dame, Notre Dame Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. (See Earlham above.)

Indiana State Normal. Terre Haute.

Versus Illinois State Normal, Normal. (See under Illinois.)

Versus Oshkosh Normal, Oshkosh, Wis.

1912. Oshkosh Aff. won.

1913. At Terre Haute, Indiana Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Oshkosh, Oshkosh Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. No report.

1916. At Oshkosh, Oshkosh Aff. 2 to 1.

Purdue University. Lafayette.

Versus Michigan Agri. College, East Lansing.

1914. At Lafayette, Purdue Aff. 2 to 1.

At East Lansing, Michigan Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Lafayette, Purdue Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Iowa State College, Ames.

1916. At Ames, Iowa State Aff. 3 to 0.

University of Notre Dame. Notre Dame.

Versus Indiana University. (See Indiana Univ. above.)

Versus Wabash College, Crawfordsville.

1912. Notre Dame Aff. won.

1913. At Crawfordsville, Notre Dame Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Western Reserve Univ., Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

Wabash College. Crawfordsville.

Versus Butler College, Indianapolis.

1915. At Indianapolis, Butler Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Indiana University. (See Indiana above.)

Versus University of Notre Dame. (See Notre Dame above.)

Versus DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

1911. At Crawfordsville, DePauw Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Earlham College, Ind. (See Earlham above.)

IOWA

Amity College. College Springs. (This college has closed its doors.)

Versus Cooper College, Sterling, Kansas. (See Cooper College, Kans.)

Buena Vista College. Storm Lake.

Versus Ellsworth College, Iowa Falls.

1912. At Storm Lake, Buena Vista Aff. won.

1915. At Storm Lake, Ellsworth Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Highland Park College, Des Moines.

1913. At Des Moines, Highland Park Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Lenox College, Hopkinton, Ia.

1913. At Storm Lake, Buena Vista Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Central College, Pella, Ia.

1915. At Pella, Buena Vista Neg. 3 to 0. (See Central College below.)

Central College. Pella.

Versus Buena Vista College, Storm Lake.

1909. Central won 3 to 0.

1910. Central won 2 to 1.

1911. Central won 3 to 0.

1915. At Pella, Buena Vista Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Highland Park College, Des Moines.

1911. Highland Park Aff. won.

1912. Central Aff. won.

1913. At Des Moines, Highland Park Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. (Women's Debate.) At Des Moines, Central Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Simpson College, Indianola, Ia.

1911. (Women's Debate.) Simpson Neg. won.

1914. (Women's Debate.) At Pella, Simpson Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Iowa Wesleyan, Mt. Pleasant.

1911. (Women's Debate.) Central Neg. won.

Versus Des Moines Baptist College.

1913. At Pella, Central Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Des Moines, Central Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Ellsworth College, Iowa Falls.

1914. At Pella. No report.

1915. At Iowa Falls, Ellsworth Aff. 3 to 0.
Coe College. Cedar Rapids.
 Versus Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.
 1910. At Ripon, Coe Neg. won.
 1911. At Cedar Rapids, Coe Affirmative won.
 1912. At Ripon, Ripon Aff. 3 to 0.
 1915. At Cedar Rapids, Coe Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
 1911. At Northfield, Carleton Aff. 3 to 0.
 1912. At Cedar Rapids, Carleton Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia.
 1913. At Cedar Rapids, Morningside Neg. 2 to 1.
 1914. At Sioux City, Morningside Aff. 3 to 0.
 1915. At Cedar Rapids, Coe Aff. 2 to 1.
 Versus Iowa Teachers' College, Cedar Falls.
 1913. At Cedar Falls, Teachers' Coll. Aff. 3 to 0.
 1914. At Cedar Rapids, Coe Coll. Aff. 3 to 0.
 1915. At Cedar Falls, Coe Neg. 2 to 1.
 1916. (Women's Dual.) At Cedar Rapids, Teachers' Neg. 3 to 0.
 At Cedar Falls, Coe Neg. 2 to 1.
 Versus Northwestern College, Naperville, Ill.
 1915. At Naperville, Northwestern Coll. Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Cornell Coll., Mt. Vernon, Ia.
 1916. At Mt. Vernon, Coe Neg. 2 to 1.
 Versus Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.
 1916. At Cedar Rapids. No report.
 Versus Hamline Univ., St. Paul, Minn.
 1916. At Cedar Rapids. Decision not reported.
 Versus Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.
 1916. At St. Paul. Decision not reported.
Cornell College. Mt. Vernon.
 Versus Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.
 1911. At Mt. Vernon, Cornell Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.
 1911. Monmouth Neg. won.
 Versus Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.
 1912. At Galesburg, Cornell Neg. won.
 1913. At Mt. Vernon, Knox Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Galesburg, Knox Aff. 2 to 1.
 Versus Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
 1912. At Mt. Vernon, Beloit Neg. won.
 1913. At Beloit, Cornell Neg. 3 to 0.
 1914. At Mt. Vernon, Cornell Aff. 2 to 1.
 1915. At Beloit, Beloit Neg. 3 to 0.
 At Mt. Vernon, Cornell Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Coe College, Ia. (See Coe Coll. above.)
 Versus Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.
 1916. At Grinnell, Grinnell Aff. 2 to 1.
 Versus Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.
 1916. At Appleton, Lawrence Aff. 3 to 0.
- Des Moines College. Des Moines.**
 Versus Iowa Wesleyan Univ., Mt. Pleasant, Ia.
 1912. Iowa Wesleyan won.
 Versus Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Ia.
 1912. Upper Iowa won.
 Versus Central College, Ia. (See Central above.)
 Versus Highland Park Coll., Des Moines.
 1913. At Des Moines, Des Moines Aff. won 2 to 1.
 Versus Ellsworth College, Iowa Falls.
 1914. At Iowa Falls, Ellsworth Aff. 2 to 1.
 Versus Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia.
 1915. At Des Moines, Penn Neg. 2 to 1.
 Versus Parsons College, Fairfield, Ia.
 1915. At Fairfield, Parsons Aff. 3 to 0.
- Drake University. Des Moines.**
 Versus Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.
 1906. Drake won.
 1907. Grinnell won.
 1908. Drake won.
 1909. Grinnell won.
 1910. Drake won.
 1911. Grinnell won.
 1912. Drake won.
 1913. At Grinnell. No report.
 1914. At Grinnell, Grinnell Aff. 3 to 2.
 1915. At Des Moines. No report.
 Versus Iowa State College, Ames.

1906. Ames won.

1907. Ames won.

1908. Drake won.

1909. Drake won.

1910. Ames won.

1911. Ames won.

1912. Drake won.

1913. At Des Moines, Drake Aff. 4 to 1.

Versus Univ. of South Dakota, Vermillion.

1912. Drake Neg. won.

1913. Drake Aff. 2 to 1. At Vermillion.

1914. At Des Moines, Drake Aff. 5 to 0.

1915. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 4 to 1.

Versus University of S. California, Los Angeles.

1913. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. Neg. 3 to 0.

At Des Moines, U. S. C. Aff. 2 to 1.

Ellsworth College. Iowa Falls.

Versus Buena Vista College, Ia. (See Buena Vista.)

Versus Central College, Ia. (See Central Coll. above.)

Versus Des Moines College, Ia. (See Des Moines above.)

Grinnell College. Grinnell.

Versus Drake University, Ia. (See Drake Univ. above.)

Versus Iowa State College, Ames.

1911. Ames won.

1912. No report.

1913. At Ames, Iowa State Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of S. Dakota, Vermillion.

1914. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 5 to 0.

1915. At Grinnell, S. Dak. Neg. 5 to 0.

Versus Yankton College, S. Dak.

1914. At Yankton, Yankton Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.

1915. At St. Paul, Macalester Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Cornell College, Ia. (See Cornell above.)

Versus Coe College, Ia. (See Coe College above.)

Highland Park College. Des Moines.

Versus Central College, Pella, Ia. (See Central Coll. above.)

Versus Des Moines College, Ia. (See Des Moines Coll. above.)

Versus Iowa Teachers' College, Cedar Falls.

1914. At Des Moines, Highland Park Aff. 3 to 0.

At Cedar Falls, Teachers' Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. Dual debate, one at each institution. Decision not reported.

1916. At Des Moines, Teachers' Neg. 2 to 1.

At Cedar Falls, Highland Park Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Buena Vista College, Storm Lake, Ia. (See Buena Vista above.)

Versus Lenox College, Hopkinton, Ia.

1913. At Hopkinton, Highland Park Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Leander Clark College, Toledo, Ia.

1914. At Des Moines, Highland Park Aff. 3 to 0.

At Toledo, Highland Park Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Simpson College, Indianola, Ia.

1914. At Indianola, Simpson Aff. 2 to 1. (Women's Debate.)

Iowa State College. Ames.

Versus Drake University, Ia. (See Drake above.)

Versus Grinnell College, Ia. (See Grinnell above.)

Versus Iowa Teachers' College, Cedar Falls, Ia.

1913. At Ames, Iowa State won 3 to 0.

At Cedar Falls, Teachers' won 2 to 1.

Versus Kansas State Agri. College, Manhattan, Kans.

1914. At Manhattan, Kans. Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Ames, Kansas Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Manhattan, Iowa Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus University of S. Dakota, Vermillion.

1914. At Ames, S. Dak. Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Ames, S. Dak. Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Michigan Agri. College, East Lansing.

1914. At Ames, Iowa Aff. 3 to 0.

At East Lansing, Iowa Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. No report.

1916. At East Lansing, Iowa Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

1916. At Ames, Iowa Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus College Agri. Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.

1916. At Minneapolis, Minn. Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus College of Agri., Wisconsin Univ., Madison.

1916. At Ames, Iowa Aff. 2 to 1.

Iowa State Teachers' College. Cedar Falls.

Versus Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia.

1912. At Cedar Falls, Teachers' Coll. Aff. won.

At Sioux City, Morningside Aff. won.

1913. At Sioux City, Teachers' Coll. Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Cedar Falls, Morningside Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Sioux City, Morningside Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Coe College, Ia. (See Coe Coll. above.)

Versus Iowa State College, Ia. (See Iowa State Coll. above.)

Versus Highland Park Coll., Ia. (See Highland Park Coll. above.)

Versus Simpson College, Indianola, Ia.

1916. At Cedar Falls, Teachers' Coll. 3 to 0.

At Indianola, Teachers' College 3 to 0.

Iowa Wesleyan College. Mt. Pleasant.

Versus Central College, Ia. (See Central College above.)

Versus Simpson College, Indianola, Ia.

1911. Iowa Wes. won. (Women's Debate.) 1911.
Freshmen. Ia. Wesleyan Neg. won.

1912. (Freshmen.) Simpson Neg. won.

1914. At Mt. Pleasant, Simpson Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Indianola, Simpson Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Illinois Wesleyan, Bloomington, Ill.

1911. Illinois won.

Versus Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.

1913. (Sophomore debate.) At Monmouth, Monmouth
Neg. won.

1914. At Mt. Pleasant, Monmouth Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.

1914. At Mt. Pleasant, Ia. Wes. Aff. 3 to 0.

At Galesburg, Ia. Wes. Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Upper Iowa Univ., Fayette.

1914. At Fayette, Upper Ia. Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Mt. Pleasant. No report.

1916. At Fayette. Decision not given.

Leander Clark College. Toledo.

Versus Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia.

1911. At Toledo, Penn won.

1912. At Oskaloosa, Penn. Aff. won.

1913. At Toledo, Penn Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Oskaloosa, Penn Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Parsons College, Fairfield, Ia.

1911. At Fairfield, Leander Clark Coll. Aff. 3 to 0.

1912. At Toledo, Leander Clark Coll. won.

1913. At Fairfield, Parsons Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Toledo, Leander Clark Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Highland Park College, Ia. (See Highland Park
above.)

Luther College. Decorah.

Versus Gustavus Adolphus Coll., St. Peter, Minn.

1912. At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus Aff. won.

1913. No report.

1914. At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. No report.

1916. At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus Neg. 3 to 0.

Lenox College. Hopkinton.

Versus Buena Vista College, Ia. (See Buena Vista above.)

Versus Highland Park College, Ia. (See Highland Park
above.)

Morningside College. Sioux City.

Versus upper Iowa University, Fayette.

1911. At Sioux City, Morningside Aff. won.

At Fayette, Upper Iowa Aff. won.

Versus Nebraska Wesleyan, University Place.

1912. Morningside Aff. won.

Versus Iowa Teachers' College. (See Iowa Teachers' Coll.
above.)

Versus Coe College, Ia. (See Coe Coll. above.)

Versus S. Dakota Wesleyan, Mitchell.

1912. S. Dak. Neg. won.

1916. At Sioux City, Morningside Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Simpson College, Indianola, Ia.

1915. (Women's Debate.) At Sioux City, Simpson Neg.
3 to 0.

At Indianola, Simpson Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans.

1915. At Winfield, Southwestern Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.

1916. At Northfield, Morningside Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of S. Dakota, Vermillion.

1916. (Women's Debate.) At Sioux City, Morningside
Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Huron College, Huron, S. Dak.

1916. (Women's Debate.) At Huron, Morningside Neg.
2 to 1.

Parsons College. Fairfield.

Versus Leander Clark College, Ia. (See Leander Clark
above.)

Versus Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia.

1911. Penn College won.

1912. Penn College won.

1913. At Oskaloosa, Penn Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Fairfield, Parsons Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Oskaloosa, Penn Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Fairfield, Parsons Neg. 2 to 1.

At Oskaloosa. Decision not reported.

Versus Des Moines College, Ia.

1915. At Fairfield, Parsons Aff. 3 to 0.

Penn College. Oskaloosa.

Versus Leander Clark College, Ia. (See Leander Clark
above.)

Versus Parsons College, Ia. (See Parsons Coll. above.)

Versus Des Moines College, Ia. (See Des Moines above.)

Simpson College. Indianola.

Versus Central College, Pella, Ia. (See Central Coll.
above.)

Versus Iowa Wesleyan College. (See Iowa Wesleyan
above.)

Versus Highland Park Coll., Ia. (See Highland Park Coll.
above.)

Versus Baker University, Baldwin, Kansas.

1912. At Baldwin, Baker Aff. won.

Versus Morningside Coll., Ia. (See Morningside Coll. above.)

Versus Iowa Teachers' College. (See Iowa Teachers' Coll. above.)

Versus Upper Iowa Univ., Fayette.

1914. At Indianola. No report.

1915. At Fayette, Upper Iowa Aff. 3 to 0.

University of Iowa. Iowa City.

Versus Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

1911. At Iowa City, Iowa won 2 to 1.

1913. At Minneapolis, Minn. Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Minneapolis, Minn. Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Iowa City, Iowa Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Wisconsin, Madison.

1911. At Madison, Iowa won 3 to 0.

1913. At Iowa City, Iowa Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Illinois, Urbana. (See under Illinois.)

Versus University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

1912. No report.

1913. No report.

1914. At Iowa City, Nebraska Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Ill.

1916. At Evanston, Iowa Aff. 2 to 1.

Upper Iowa College. Fayette.

Versus Iowa Wesleyan. (See Iowa Wesleyan above.)

Versus Morningside College, Ia. (See Morningside Coll. above.)

Versus Simpson College, Ia. (See Simpson Coll. above.)

KANSAS

Baker University. Baldwin.

Versus Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia.

1911. At Mt. Vernon, Cornell Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.

1911. At Ottawa, Ottawa Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Baldwin, Ottawa Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Ottawa, Baker Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Washburn College, Topeka, Kans.

1910. At Topeka, Baker Aff. 2 to 1.

1911. At Baldwin, Washburn Neg. 3 to 0.

1913. At Topeka, Washburn Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Baldwin, Baker Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Topeka. No report.

1916. At Baldwin, Washburn Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Simpson College, Indianola, Ia.

1912. At Baldwin, Baker Aff. won.

Versus Nebraska Wesleyan Univ., Univ. Place, Nebr.

1913. At Baldwin, Baker Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At University Place, Baker Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Kansas Agri. Coll., Manhattan. (See Kans. Agri. Coll. below.)

1916. At Baldwin, Baker Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans.

1916. At Emporia, Baker Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Southwestern Coll., Kans. (See Southwestern Coll. below.)

Bethany College. Lindsborg.

Versus Augustana College, Ill.

1912. Augustana won.

1913. At Rock Island, Ill., Bethany Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Lindsborg, Bethany Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Wm. Jewell Coll., Mo. (See under Missouri.)

Bethel College. Newton.

Versus Cooper Coll., Sterling, Kans.

1911. At Newton, Cooper Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Newton, Cooper Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Sterling, Bethel Freshmen Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Sterling, Bethel Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus McPherson College, McPherson, Kans.

1914. At Newton, Bethel Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans.

1915. At Newton, Bethel Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Friends University, Wichita, Kans.

1916. At Newton, Bethel Aff. 3 to 0.

Campbell College. Holton. (This college has discontinued.)

Versus Cooper College, Sterling, Kans.

- 1911. At Sterling, Cooper Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1912. At Holton, Campbell Neg. won.
- 1913. At Sterling, Campbell Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus York College, York, Nebr.

- 1912. At York, York Neg. won.

College of Emporia. Emporia.

Versus Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas.

- 1911. At Emporia, Ottawa Aff. 3 to 0.
 - 1912. At Ottawa, Emporia Neg. won.
 - 1913. At Emporia, Ottawa Aff. 2 to 1.
 - 1914. At Ottawa, Emporia Neg. 2 to 1.
 - 1915. At Ottawa, Ottawa Neg. 1 to 0.
 - 1916. At Emporia, Emporia Neg. 3 to 0.
- Versus Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas.
- 1910. At Emporia, Southwestern won.
 - At Winfield, Southwestern won.
 - 1911. At Winfield, Southwestern won.
 - 1913. At Winfield, Southwestern Neg. 3 to 0.
 - 1914. At Emporia, Southwestern Neg. 2 to 1.
 - 1915. At Winfield, Southwestern Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Kansas State Normal, Emporia.

- 1915. At Emporia, Kansas Normal 1 to 0.

Versus Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.

- 1916. At Emporia, Baker Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Kansas Agri. College, Manhattan.

- 1916. At Manhattan, Kans. Agri. Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Washburn College, Topeka, Kans.

- 1916. At Topeka, Washburn Aff. 2 to 1.

Cooper College. Sterling.

Versus Campbell College, Holton, Kans. (See Campbell above.)

Versus Bethel College. (See Bethel, Kans., above.)

Versus Amity College, Colorado Springs, Iowa.

- 1911. At College Springs, Amity Aff. won.
 - 1912. At Sterling, Cooper Neg. won.
 - 1913. At College Springs, Cooper Neg. 2 to 1.
- Versus Northwestern State Normal, Alva, Okla.
- 1912. At Alva. Decision Neg., college not named.
- Versus McPherson College, McPherson, Kansas.

1913. At Sterling, Cooper Neg. 3 to 0.
1914. At McPherson, McPherson Neg. 3 to 0.
1915. At Sterling, Cooper Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Kansas City University, Kansas City.

1914. At Sterling, Kansas City Aff. 2 to 1.
1915. At Kansas City, Kansas City Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Friends University, Wichita, Kans.

1914. (Women's Debate.) At Sterling, Cooper 2 to 1.
(Women's Debate.) At Wichita, Friends Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. (Women's Debate.) At Sterling, Cooper Aff. 2 to 1.

(Women's Debate.) At Wichita, Friends Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Wichita. (Triangular with Bethel.) No report.

Fairmount College. Wichita.

Versus Kansas Agricultural College, Manhattan.

1911. At Wichita, Fairmount Aff. 2 to 1.
At Manhattan, Fairmount Neg. 3 to 0.
1912. At Wichita, Fairmount Aff. won.
At Manhattan. Decision 1 to 1.
1913. At Wichita, K. S. A. C. Neg. 2 to 1.
At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Aff. 2 to 1.
1914. At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Aff. 3 to 0. (Women's Debate.)

Versus Kansas Wesleyan Univ., Salina.

1913. (Women's Debate.) At Salina, Kans. Wesleyan Neg. 3 to 0.
1914. (Women's Debate.) At Wichita, Fairmount Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Phillips Univ., Enid, Okla.

1914. At Wichita, Friends Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas.

1915. At Wichita, Southwestern Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Friends University, Wichita, Kansas.

1914. At Fairmount, Wichita, Friends Neg. 2 to 1.
1915. At Friends, Wichita, Friends Aff. 2 to 1.
1916. At Fairmount, Wichita, Fairmount Aff. 3 to 0.

At Friends, Wichita, Fairmount Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans.

1916. (Women's Debate.) At Wichita, Fairmount Aff.
3 to 0.

Versus Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.

1916. (Women's Debate.) At Ottawa, Ottawa Aff. 2
to 1.

Friends University. Wichita.

Versus Kansas Wesleyan Univ., Salina, Kans.

1911. At Wichita, Kans. Wesleyan won.

At Salina, Kansas Wesleyan won.

Versus Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans.

1912. Southwestern Aff. won.

1915. At Winfield, Southwestern Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus McPherson College, McPherson, Kans.

1913. At Wichita, Friends Aff. 2 to 1.

At McPherson, Friends Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Fairmount College, Kans. (See Fairmount College
above.)

Versus Oklahoma Methodist Univ., Guthrie, Okla.

1914. At Guthrie, Okla. M. U. Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Wichita. No decision. (Debate forfeited to
Friends.)

Versus Cooper College, Kans. (See Cooper above.)

Versus Bethel College, Kans. (See Bethel College above.)

Kansas State Agricultural College. Manhattan.

Versus Fairmount College, Wichita, Kansas. (See Fair-
mount Coll. above.)

Versus Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina, Kans.

1912. At Salina, Kansas Wesleyan Neg. won.

1913. At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. (Women's Debate.) At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Aff.
2 to 1.

(Women's Debate.) At Salina, Kans. Wesleyan
Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. (Women's Debate.) At Manhattan, K. S. A. C.
Aff. 2 to 1.

(Women's Debate.) At Salina, Kans. Wesleyan
Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater.

1912. At Manhattan, Oklahoma won.

At Stillwater, Oklahoma won.

1913. At Manhattan, Kansas Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Stillwater, Oklahoma Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. 2 to 1.

Versus Kansas State Normal, Emporia.

1913. At Emporia. No decision.

1915. At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. 1 to 0.

1916. At Manhattan, Kans. Normal Neg. 1 to 0.

At Emporia, K. S. A. C. Neg. 1 to 0.

Versus Colorado Agricultural College, Ft. Collins.

1913. At Ft. Collins, Kansas Neg. won.

1914. At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Ft. Collins, Colorado Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Washburn College, Topeka, Kansas.

1914. At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Aff. 2 to 1.

At Topeka, Washburn Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. (Women's Debate.) At Manhattan, Washburn
Neg. 3 to 0.

(Women's Debate.) At Topeka, Washburn Aff. 3
to 0.

1916. (Women's Debate.) At Manhattan, Washburn
Neg. 3 to 0.

(Women's Debate.) At Topeka, Washburn Aff.
3 to 0.

At Topeka, Washburn Neg. 3 to 0. (Men's Pent-
angular League.)

Versus Iowa State College, Ames.

1914. At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Ames, K. S. A. C. Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Manhattan, Iowa Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus University of S. Dakota, Vermillion.

1914. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Manhattan, S. Dak. Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Baker University, Baldwin, Kansas.

1915. At Manhattan, Baker Neg. 3 to 0.

At Baldwin, Baker Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Baldwin, Baker Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans. (See Coll. of Emporia above.)

Versus Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas.

1916. At Manhattan, Ottawa Neg. 3 to 0.

Kansas State Normal. Emporia.

Versus Kansas State Agricultural Coll. (See Kans. Agri. above.)

Versus Northwestern Normal, Alva, Oklahoma.

1914. At Emporia, Northwestern Normal Neg. 3 to 0.

At Alva, Northwestern Normal Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Emporia, Kansas Normal 1 to 0.

At Alva, Northwestern Normal Aff. 1 to 0.

Versus College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans. (See Coll. of Emporia above.)

Kansas Wesleyan University. Salina.

Versus Friends University, Kans. (See Friends Univ. above.)

Versus Kansas State Agricultural College. (See Kans. Agri. above.)

Versus Fairmount College, Kans. (See Fairmount Coll. above.)

Versus Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas.

1912. At Salina, Kans. Wesleyan won.

1913. At Ottawa, Ottawa Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Salina, Kans. Wesleyan Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Ottawa, Ottawa Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Denver, Denver, Colo.

1914. At Salina, Kans. Wesleyan Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Denver, Kans. Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.

1915. At Salina, Kans. Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas.

1916. At Salina, Southwestern Neg. 2 to 1.

At Winfield, Kansas Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

McPherson College. McPherson.

Versus Cooper College, Kans. (See Cooper Coll. above.)

Versus Friends University, Kansas. (See Friends Univ. above.)

Versus Bethel College, Kans. (See Bethel Coll. above.)

Midland College. Atchinson.

Versus Doane College, Crete, Nebr.

1916. At Atchinson, Doane Aff. 3 to 0.

Ottawa University. Ottawa.

Versus Wm. Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.

1898. At Ottawa, Ottawa Neg. 2 to 1.

1899. At Liberty, Ottawa Aff. 2 to 1.

1900. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Aff. 3 to 0.

1908. At Ottawa, Wm. Jewell Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Park College, Parkville, Mo.

1900. At Parkville, Ottawa Neg. 3 to 0.

1901. At Ottawa, Park Aff. 2 to 1.

1910. At Ottawa, Park Neg. 3 to 0.

1911. At Parkville, Park Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Ottawa, Ottawa Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus College of Emporia, Kans. (See Coll. of Emporia above.)

Versus Baker University, Kans. (See Baker Univ. above.)

Versus Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans.

1907. At Ottawa, Southwestern won 2 to 1.

1908. At Winfield, Southwestern won 2 to 1.

1909. At Ottawa, Ottawa Neg. 3 to 0.

1913. At Ottawa, Ottawa Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Winfield, Southwestern Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Kansas Wesleyan. (See Kansas Wesleyan above.)

Versus Washburn College, Topeka, Kansas.

1909. At Ottawa, Ottawa Aff. 2 to 1.

1912. At Ottawa, Ottawa Aff. won.

(Women.) At Topeka, Ottawa Neg. won.

1913. (Women.) At Ottawa, Washburn Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Topeka, Washburn Neg. 2 to 1. (Women.)

1915. At Ottawa, Washburn Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Ottawa, Washburn Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Denver, Denver, Colo.

1913. At Ottawa, Ottawa Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Fairmount College, Kans. (See Fairmount Coll. above.)

Southwestern College. Winfield.

Versus Baker University, Baldwin, Kansas.

1906. Southwestern won.

Versus Ottawa Univ., Ottawa, Kansas. (See Ottawa above.)

Versus College of Emporia, Kansas. (See Coll. of Emporia above.)

Versus Friends Univ., Kans. (See Friends Univ. above.)

Versus Fairmount Coll., Kans. (See Fairmount Coll. above.)

Versus Kansas Wesleyan, Kans. (See Kans. Wesleyan above.)

Versus Oklahoma Baptist College, Blackwell, Okla.

1911. At Blackwell, Southwestern won.

1912. Southwestern Neg. won.

1913. At Blackwell, Okla. Baptist Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Park College, Parkville, Mo.

1912. At Winfield, Southwestern Aff. won.

1913. At Parkville, Park Neg. won 2 to 1.

1914. At Winfield, Southwestern Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Epworth Univ., Oklahoma City, Okla.

1911. At Winfield, Southwestern won.

Versus Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia.

1915. At Winfield, Southwestern Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Phillips Univ., Enid, Okla.

1915. At Enid, Southwestern Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.

1916. At Winfield, Southwestern Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Oklahoma A. & M. Coll., Stillwater, Okla.

1916. At Winfield, Southwestern Neg. 2 to 1.

At Stillwater, Okla. Neg. 2 to 1.

University of Kansas. Lawrence.

Versus University of Missouri, Columbia.

1911. Missouri Aff. won.

1912. At Columbia, Mo., Kans. Neg. won.

1913. At Columbia, Kans. Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Lawrence, Kans. Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Columbia, Missouri Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Lawrence, Kans. Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Colorado, Boulder.

1911. Colorado Neg. won.

1912. Colorado Neg. won.

1913. At Boulder, Colo. Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Lawrence, Kans. Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Boulder, Kans. Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Lawrence, Kans. Aff. 2 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Oklahoma, Norman.

1911. Kansas Aff. won.

1912. No report.

1913. At Lawrence, Kans. Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Norman, Okla. Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Lawrence, Kansas Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Norman, Okla. Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln.

1916. At Lawrence, Nebr. Neg. 2 to 1.

At Lincoln, Nebr. Aff. 2 to 1.

Washburn College. Topeka.

Versus Baker University, Baldwin, Kans. (See Baker Univ. above.)

Versus College of Emporia, Kans. (See Coll. of Emporia above.)

Versus Kans. State Agri. Coll. (See Kans. Agri. above.)

Versus Ottawa Univ., Kans. (See Ottawa Univ. above.)

Versus University of Denver, Denver, Colo.

1910. Denver Neg. won.

1911. Washburn won.

Versus Nebraska Wesleyan Univ., University Place, Nebr.

1910. Nebraska Neg. 2 to 1.

1911. Nebraska Aff. 2 to 1.

1912. No report or no debate.

1913. At Univ. Place, Nebr. Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Park College, Parkville, Mo.

1913. At Topeka, Washburn Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Parkville, Park Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Wm. Jewell Coll., Liberty, Mo.

1909. Decision not reported.

1910. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Neg. won.
 1914. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Neg. 3 to 0.

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky. Lexington.

Versus Alabama University. (See under Alabama.)

Versus Vanderbilt Univ. (See under Tennessee.)

LOUISIANA

Centenary College. Shreveport.

Versus Ouachita College, Arkansas.

1915. At Shreveport, Ouachita Aff. 3 to 0.

Louisiana College.

Versus Ouachita College, Arkansas.

1916. At Arkadelphia, Arkans., Ouachita Neg. 3 to 0.

Louisiana State University. Baton Rouge.

Versus Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville.

1912. Louisiana won.

1914. At Knoxville, Tennessee Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Texas, Austin.

1912. Louisiana won.

1914. At Baton Rouge, Texas Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Austin, Texas Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

1913. At Baton Rouge, Louisiana Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Baton Rouge, Louisiana Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Mississippi, Oxford.

1913. At Oxford, Louisiana Neg. 2 to 0.

Versus Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

1916. At Baton Rouge, Baylor Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Southern Methodist Univ., Dallas, Texas.

1916. At Dallas, Louisiana Neg. 2 to 1.

Tulane University. New Orleans.

Versus Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

1911. At New Orleans, Vanderbilt won.

Versus Univ. of Georgia, Athens.

1911. At Athens, Tulane won.

1913. At New Orleans, Tulane Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

1912. Univ. of Virginia won.

Versus Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. (See under N. Carolina.)

1912. Univ. of N. Carolina won.

Versus Washington and Lee Univ., Lexington, Va.

1913. At Lexington, Tulane won 3 to 0.

1914. At New Orleans, Washington and Lee Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

1914. At Philadelphia, Tulane Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At New Orleans, Pennsylvania Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn.

1915. At Auburn, Tulane Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At New Orleans, Tulane Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Florida, Gainesville.

1916. At Gainesville, Florida Neg. 3 to 0.

MAINE

Bates College. Lewiston.

Versus Clark College, Worcester, Mass. (See Clark Coll., Mass.)

1911. At Lewiston, Bates Neg. won.

1912. At Worcester, Bates Aff. won.

1913. At Lewiston, winner not designated.

1915. At Worcester, Clark Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Lewiston, Clark Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus College of City of New York.

1911. Bates Neg. won.

Versus Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

1912. At Lewiston, Colgate Aff. won.

1913. At Hamilton, Bates Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Tufts College, Medford, Mass.

1915. At Lewiston. No report.

1916. At Medford, Bates Neg. 3 to 0.

Bowdoin College. Brunswick.

Versus Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

1911. At Middletown, Wesleyan won.

1912. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Neg. won.

1913. At Middletown, Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Aff. 2 to 1.
 1915. At Middletown, Wesleyan Neg. 3 to 0.
 1916. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus New York University, N. Y. City.
 1912. At New York City, N. Y. U. Aff. won.
 Versus Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
 1913. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Aff. 3 to 0.
 1914. At Clinton, Hamilton Aff. 3 to 0.
 1915. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Neg. 2 to 1.
 1916. At Clinton, Hamilton Neg. 2 to 1.
Colby College. Waterville.
 Versus Clark College, Worcester, Mass.
 1913. At Worcester, Colby Aff. 3 to 0.
 Versus University of Maine, Orono.
 1915. At Waterville, Colby Aff. 2 to 1.
 At Orono, Colby Neg. 3 to 0.
University of Maine. Orono.
 Versus Colby College, Waterville, Me. (See Colby Coll.
 above.)

MARYLAND

- Johns Hopkins University.** Baltimore.
 Versus Washington and Lee Univ., Lexington, Va.
 1911. Winner not designated.
 Versus Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
 1911. Winner not designated.
 Versus College of the City of New York.
 1912. At Baltimore, Aff. won.
 At New York City, Aff. won.
 Versus University of Virginia, Charlottesville.
 1913. At Chapel Hill, Johns Hopkins Aff. 5 to 0.
 1914. At Chapel Hill, N. C., Johns Hopkins 4 to 1.
 1915. At Chapel Hill, N. C., Johns Hopkins Neg. 4 to
 1916. At Chapel Hill, Johns Hopkins Neg. 3 to 2.
 Versus Univ. of N. Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. (See under
 N. Carolina.)
 1913. At Charlottesville, N. Carolina Aff. 3 to 2.
 1914. At Charlottesville, Johns Hopkins Neg. 5 to 0.

1915. At Charlottesville, Johns Hopkins Aff. 5 to 0.
1916. At Charlottesville, Johns Hopkins Aff. 5 to 0.

MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst College. Amherst.

Versus Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. (See
Wesleyan, Conn.)

Versus Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

1913. At Amherst, Amherst Aff. 3 to 0.

Boston College. Boston.

Versus Clark College, Worcester, Mass.

1910. Boston won.

1911. Boston Aff. won.

1912. At Worcester, Clark Neg. won.

1913. At Boston, Boston Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Georgetown College, Washington, D. C.

1913. At Washington, Boston Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Washington, Georgetown Neg. 5 to 0.

Versus Fordham Univ., Fordham, N. Y.

1913. At Boston, Boston Neg. 3 to 0.

Clark College. Worcester.

Versus Boston College, Mass. (See Boston College above.)

Versus Bates College, Maine.

1907. Bates won.

1908. Clark won.

1910. Clark won.

1911. At Lewiston, Bates won.

1912. At Worcester, Bates Aff. won.

1913. At Lewiston, winner not designated.

1914. No report.

1915. At Worcester, Clark Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Lewiston, Clark Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Middlebury College.

1910. Clark won.

1911. Middlebury defaulted.

Versus Tufts College, Medford, Mass.

1905. Clark won.

1907. Clark won.

1908. Tufts won.

- 1915. At Medford, Tufts Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1916. At Worcester, Clark Aff. 2 to 1.
- Versus Colby College, Waterville, Me.
- 1913. At Worcester, Colby Aff. 3 to 0.
- Versus Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.
- 1914. At Worcester, Clark Neg. 3 to 0.
- Versus Massachusetts Agri. Coll., Amherst.
- 1914. At Worcester, Clark Neg. 3 to 0.
- Harvard University.** Cambridge.
- Versus Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (See Yale, Conn.)
- Versus Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- 1895. Harvard Neg. won.
- 1896. Harvard Neg. won.
- 1897. Harvard Neg. won.
- 1898. Harvard Aff. won.
- 1899. Harvard Neg. won.
- 1900. Harvard Aff. won.
- 1901. Harvard Neg. won.
- 1902. Princeton Aff. won.
- 1903. Princeton Aff. won.
- 1904. Harvard Neg. won.
- 1905. Princeton Aff. won.
- 1906. Princeton Aff. won.
- 1907. Princeton Aff. won.
- 1908. Harvard Neg. won.
- 1909. No report. (Triangular including Yale began here.)
- 1910. At Cambridge, Harvard Neg. won.
- 1911. No report.
- 1912. Princeton won.
- 1913. At Princeton, Harvard Aff. 3 to 0.
(Freshmen.) At Cambridge, Princeton Aff. won.
- 1914. At Cambridge, Harvard Neg. 3 to 0.
(Freshmen, no report.)
- 1915. No report.
(Freshmen.) No report.
- 1916. At Cambridge, Princeton Aff. 3 to 0.
At Princeton Neg. 2 to 1. (Freshmen.)

Holy Cross College. Worcester.

Versus Fordham College, Fordham, N. Y.

1912. At New York City, Holy Cross Aff. won.

1913. At Worcester, Holy Cross Aff. 3 to 0.

Massachusetts Agri. College. Amherst.

Versus Clark College, Mass. (See Clark Coll. above.)

Versus Rhode Island State Col. (See under Rhode Island.)

Tufts College. Medford.

Versus Clark College, Mass. (See Clark College above.)

Versus Bates College, Maine. (See Bates Coll. above.)

Williams College. Williamstown.

Versus Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. (See Wesleyan, Conn.)

Versus Amherst College, Mass. (See Amherst above.)

Versus Brown University, Providence, R. I.

1913. At Williamstown, Brown Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Providence, Brown Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

1913. At Hanover, Dartmouth Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Williamstown, Dartmouth Aff. 2 to 1.

MICHIGAN

Adrian College. Adrian.

Versus Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich.

1911. Adrian Aff. won.

Versus Michigan State Normal, Ypsilanti.

1914. At Adrian, Mich. Normal Neg. 3 to 0.

At Ypsilanti, Mich. Normal Aff. 2 to 1.

Albion College. Albion.

Versus Earlham College, Indiana. (See Earlham, Ind., above.)

Versus Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

1909. Decision not reported.

1910. Decision not reported.

1911. At Albion, Albion Neg. won.

1912. (Freshmen.) At Beloit, Beloit Neg. won.

1913. At Albion, Albion Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Beloit, Beloit Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

- 1911. At Appleton, Lawrence Neg. won.
- 1912. At Albion, Albion Aff. won.
- 1913. At Appleton, Albion Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Albion, Lawrence Neg. 2 to 1.
- Versus Butler College, Irvington, Ind. (See Butler, Ind.)
- Versus Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich.
- 1915. At Albion, Albion Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1916. At Hillsdale, Albion Neg. 2 to 1.
- Versus Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti.
- 1916. At Albion, Albion Neg. 3 to 0.

Alma College. Alma.

- Versus Hope College, Holland, Mich.
- 1909. At Alma, Alma Aff. won.
- 1910. At Holland, Hope Aff. won.
- 1911. At Alma, Alma Aff. won.
- 1912. At Holland, Hope Aff. won.
- 1913. At Alma, Hope Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Holland, Hope Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Alma, Hope Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Holland, Alma Neg. 2 to 1.
- Versus Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.
- 1911. At Olivet, Olivet Aff. won.
- 1912. At Alma, Olivet Neg. won.
- 1913. At Olivet. No report.
- 1914. At Alma, Alma Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Olivet, Olivet Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1916. At Alma, Olivet Neg. 2 to 1.
- Versus Michigan Agri. College, East Lansing.
- 1911. At East Lansing, M. A. C. Aff. won.
- 1912. At Alma, Alma Aff. won.
- 1913. At East Lansing, M. A. C. Aff. 3 to 0.
- Versus Michigan State Normal, Ypsilanti.
- 1912. At Ypsilanti, State Normal won.
- 1913. At Alma, State Normal Neg. 2 to 1.

Ferris Institute. Big Rapids.

- Versus Michigan State Normal, Ypsilanti. (See Mich. Normal below.)
- Versus Mich. Central Normal. (See Mich. Central Normal below.)

Versus Olivet College, Mich. (See Olivet Coll. below.)

Hillsdale College. Hillsdale.

Versus Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.

1912. At Kalamazoo, Kalamazoo Aff. won.

1913. At Kalamazoo, Kalamazoo Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Hillsdale, Hillsdale Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Kalamazoo, Kalamazoo Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Hillsdale, Kalamazoo Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Hope College, Holland, Mich.

1915. At Hillsdale, Hillsdale Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Holland, Hope Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Albion College, Albion, Mich. (See Albion Coll. above.)

Versus Michigan State Normal, Ypsilanti.

1916. At Hillsdale, Mich. Normal 2 to 1.

At Ypsilanti, Hillsdale Neg. 2 to 1.

Hope College. Holland.

Versus Alma College, Mich. (See Alma College above.)

Versus Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.

1909. At Holland, Olivet Neg. won.

1910. At Olivet, Hope Neg. won.

1911. At Holland, Hope Aff. won.

1912. At Olivet, Hope won.

1913. At Holland, Hope Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Olivet, Olivet Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Holland, Hope Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Olivet, Olivet Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Hillsdale College, Mich. (See Hillsdale Coll. above.)

Versus Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.

1915. At Holland, Hope Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Kalamazoo, Kalamazoo Aff. 2 to 1.

Kalamazoo College. Kalamazoo.

Versus Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.

1911. Olivet Aff. won.

Versus Hillsdale College, Mich. (See Hillsdale Coll. above.)

Versus Hope College, Mich. (See Hope College above.)

Michigan Agricultural College. East Lansing.

Versus Michigan State Normal, Ypsilanti.

1911. At Ypsilanti, Normal Neg. won.

1912. At East Lansing, Mich. Agri. Aff. won.

1913. At Ypsilanti, Normal Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Alma College, Mich. (See Alma College above.)

Versus Iowa State College, Ames, Ia.

1914. At East Lansing, Iowa State Neg. 3 to 0.

At Ames, Iowa State Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At East Lansing, Iowa Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

1914. At East Lansing, M. A. C. Aff. 3 to 0.

At Lafayette, Purdue Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Lafayette, Purdue Aff. 2 to 1.

Michigan Central State Normal.

Versus Michigan State Normal, Ypsilanti.

1915. At Ypsilanti, Ypsilanti Normal Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Ferris Institute.

1915. At Central Normal, Normal Aff. 2, Ferris 1.

Michigan State Normal. Ypsilanti.

Versus Michigan Agricultural Coll. (See Mich. Agri. Coll. above.)

Versus Hillsdale College, Mich. (See Hillsdale Coll. above.)

Versus Adrian College, Mich. (See Adrian Coll. above.)

Versus Alma College, Mich. (See Alma Coll. above.)

Versus Michigan Central Normal. (See Mich. Central Normal above.)

Versus Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.

1914. At Ypsilanti, Olivet Aff. 2 to 1.

At Olivet, Olivet Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Albion College, Albion, Mich. (See Albion Coll. above.)

Versus Ferris Institute, Big Rapids, Mich.

1915. At Big Rapids, Ferris Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Ypsilanti, Normal Aff. 3 to 0.

At Big Rapids, Normal Neg. 3 to 0.

Olivet College. Olivet.

Versus Alma College, Mich. (See Alma Coll. above.)

Versus Hope Coll., Mich. (See Hope Coll. above.)

Versus Kalamazoo Coll. (See Kalamazoo Coll. above.)

Versus Ferris Institute, Big Rapids, Mich.

1909. At Big Rapids, Olivet Neg. won.

1910. At Big Rapids, Ferris Aff. won.

1911. At Big Rapids, Ferris Aff. won.

Versus Michigan State Normal, Ypsilanti. (See Mich. State Normal above.)

University of Detroit. Detroit.

Versus Heidelberg University, Tiffin, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

University of Michigan. Ann Arbor.

Versus University of Chicago, Ill. (See under Illinois.)

Versus Northwestern Univ., Ill. (See under Illinois.)

Versus University of Illinois. (See under Illinois.)

Versus University of Wisconsin, Madison.

1915. At Madison, Michigan Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Ann Arbor, Mich. Aff. 3 to 0.

MINNESOTA

Carleton College. Northfield.

Versus Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

1911. Carleton won.

1912. At Cedar Rapids, Carleton Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.

1910. Carleton won.

1911. At Ripon, Carleton won.

1912. At Northfield, Carleton won 3 to 0.

1913. At Ripon, Carleton Neg. won 2 to 1.

1914. At Northfield, Carleton Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus S. Dakota Wesleyan, Mitchell, S. Dak.

1913. At Northfield, Carleton Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Mitchell, Carleton Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.

1915. At Northfield, Carleton Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.

1915. At St. Paul, Carleton Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.

1916. At Northfield, Carleton Aff. 3 to 0.

At Galesburg, Carleton Neg. 3 to 0.

Gustavus Adolphus College. St. Peter.

Versus Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.

1912. At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus Aff. won.

1914. At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.

1912. At St. Paul, Gustavus Adolphus Aff. won.

1916. At St. Peter, Hamline Neg. 3 to 0.

At St. Paul, Hamline Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Carleton College, Minn. (See Carleton College above.)

Versus Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.

1915. At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

1916. At Appleton, Lawrence Aff. 2 to 1.

Hamline University. St. Paul.

Versus Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

1911. At St. Paul, Lawrence Aff. won.

1912. At Appleton, Lawrence Aff. won.

Versus Carleton College, Minn. (See Carleton Coll. above.)

Versus Gustavus Adolphus Coll., Minn. (See Gustavus Adolphus above.)

Versus Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.

1913. At Hamline, Hamline Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Macalester, Hamline Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At St. Paul. No report of decision.

Versus St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.

1913. At Northfield, St. Olaf Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At St. Paul, St. Olaf Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Northfield, St. Olaf Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia.

1916. Decision not reported.

Macalester College. St. Paul.

Versus St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.

1911. At St. Paul, St. Olaf Aff. 2 to 1.

1912. At Northfield, St. Olaf Aff. won.

1913. At St. Paul, Macalester Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Northfield, St. Olaf Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At St. Paul, Macalester Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak.

1912. Macalester Aff. won.

1915. At Fargo, Fargo Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Hamline University, Minn. (See Hamline Univ. above.)

Versus Gustavus Adolphus, Minn. (See Gustavus Adolphus above.)

Versus Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.

1915. At St. Paul, Macalester Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus S. Dakota Univ., Vermillion, S. Dak.

1915. At Vermillion, Macalester Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Huron College, Huron, S. Dak.

1915. At St. Paul, Macalester Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia.

1916. Decision not reported.

St. Olaf College. Northfield.

Versus Macalester College, Minn. (See Macalester above.)

Versus Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak.

1911. At Fargo, Fargo Aff. 2 to 1.

1912. At Northfield, St. Olaf won.

Versus Hamline University, Minn. (See Hamline above.)

Versus Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

1913. At Appleton, Lawrence Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia.

1916. At Northfield, Morningside Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus S. Dak. Wesleyan, Mitchell, S. Dak.

1916. At Mitchell, S. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

St. Thomas College. St. Paul.

Versus Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak.

1911. At St. Paul, St. Thomas Neg. 3 to 0.

University of Minnesota. Minneapolis.

Versus Univ. of Iowa. (See under Iowa.)

Versus Univ. of Illinois. (See under Illinois.)

Versus University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

1912. Minnesota won.

1914. At Lincoln, Nebr. Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison.

1912. Minnesota won.

1914. At Minneapolis, Wisconsin Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. (Agri. Depts.) At Madison, Minnesota Neg. 3 to 0.
Versus Iowa State College, Ames, Ia.

1916. (Agri. Depts.) At Minneapolis, Minnesota Aff.
2 to 1.

MISSISSIPPI

Millsaps College. Jackson.

Versus Hendrix College, Conway, Arkans.

1912. At Conway, Hendrix Neg. won.

At Jackson, Hendrix Aff. won.

University of Mississippi. Oxford.

Versus Univ. of Texas, Austin.

1911. At Oxford, Texas Neg. won.

1913. At Austin, Texas Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

1912. No report.

Versus University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

1912. Tennessee Aff. won.

Versus University of Louisiana, Baton Rouge.

1913. At Oxford, Louisiana 2 to 0.

MISSOURI

Canton Christian College. Canton.

Versus Cotner College, Bethany, Nebr.

1912. At Bethany, Cotner Neg. won.

Central College. Fayette.

Versus Missouri Valley College, Marshall.

1911. At Fayette, Central Aff. won.

1912. At Marshall, Missouri Valley Aff. won.

1913. At Fayette, Central Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Marshall, Missouri Valley Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.

1911. Westminster Aff. won.

1912. At Fayette, Westminster Neg. won.

1913. At Fulton, Westminster Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Fayette, Westminster Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Hendrix College, Conway, Arkans.

1915. At Fayette, Central Aff. 2 to 1.

Drury College. Springfield.

Versus Park College, Parkville, Mo.

- 1910. At Parkville, Park Neg. won.
- 1911. At Springfield, Park Neg. won.
- 1915. At Springfield, Park Neg. 2 to 1.
- Versus William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.
- 1910. At Springfield, Wm. Jewell Neg. won.
- 1911. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1912. At Springfield, Wm. Jewell Aff. won.
- 1915. At Springfield, Drury Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1916. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

- 1913. At St. Louis, Drury Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Springfield, Drury Aff. 3 to 0.

Missouri State Normal. Warrensburg.

Versus Peru Normal, Nebraska.

- 1910. Warrensburg Normal Aff. won.
- 1911. At Peru, Warrensburg Aff. won.

Versus Northwestern Normal, Alva, Okla.

- 1913. At Alva, Northwestern Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Kansas State Agri. Coll., Manhattan.

- 1916. (Women.) At Warrensburg, Mo. Normal 1 to 0.
- At Manhattan, Kansas Agri. Aff. 1 to 0.

Missouri Valley College. Marshall.

Versus Central College, Mo. (See Central College above.)

Versus Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.

- 1911. At Marshall, Missouri Valley Aff. won.
- 1912. At Fulton, Westminster Aff. won.
- 1913. At Marshall, Westminster Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Fulton, Westminster Aff. 2 to 1.

Park College. Parkville.

Versus Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas. (See Ottawa Univ., Kans.)

Versus Southwestern College, Kansas. (See under Kansas.)

Versus Washburn College, Kans. (See under Kansas.)

Versus Drury College, Mo. (See Drury Coll. above.)

University of Missouri. Columbia.

Versus University of Kansas. (See under Kansas.)

Versus University of Oklahoma, Norman.

- 1911. At Columbia, Missouri Neg. won.

Versus University of Texas, Austin.

- 1911. At Austin, Texas Aff. won.
- 1912. At Columbia, Texas Neg. won.
- 1913. At Columbia, Texas Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1914. At Austin, Texas Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Columbia, Missouri Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Austin, Texas Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Colorado, Boulder. (See under Colorado.)**Washington University. St. Louis.**

Versus Drury College, Mo. (See Drury Coll. above.)

Westminster College. Fulton.

Versus Central College, Mo. (See Central College above.)

Versus Missouri Valley College, Mo. (See Missouri Valley Coll. above.)

William Jewell College. Liberty.

Versus Colorado College. (See under Colorado.)

Versus University of Denver, Colo. (See under Colorado.)

Versus Ottawa University, Kans. (See under Kansas.)

Versus Kansas Wesleyan Univ. (See under Kansas.)

Versus Washburn College, Kansas. (See under Kansas.)

Versus Monmouth College, Ill. (See under Illinois.)

Versus Drury College, Mo. (See Drury Coll. above.)

Versus Arkansas University. (See under Arkansas.)

Versus Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

1911. At Waco, William Jewell won 3 to 0.

1912. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Aff. won.

Versus Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas.

1910. At Lindsborg, Bethany Aff. won.

Versus Yankton College, S. Dakota.

1913. At Yankton, Wm. Jewell Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Nebraska Wesleyan Univ., University Place, Nebr.

1914. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Columbia University, New York City.

1916. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Aff. 2 to 1.

MONTANA

Montana State College. Bozeman.

Versus Utah Agri. College, Logan.

- 1910. At Logan, Utah Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1911. At Bozeman, Montana Aff. won.
- 1912. At Logan, Utah Aff. won.

Versus Montana Wesleyan Univ., Helena.

Previous to 1911 Mont. State won 5 and Wesleyan 4.

Versus University of Montana, Missoula.

- 1912. At Missoula, State Coll. Aff. won.
- 1913. At Bozeman, Mont. Univ. Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Missoula, Mont. Univ. Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Bozeman, Mont. Univ. Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Gonzaga Univ., Spokane, Wash.

- 1914. At Bozeman, Gonzaga Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Spokane, Gonzaga Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Spokane, Montana State Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus North Dakota Agri. Coll., Fargo.

- 1916. At Bozeman, Montana State Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Idaho, Moscow.

- 1916. At Bozeman, Montana State Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus S. Dakota Agri. College, Brookings.

- 1916. Montana State Neg. 3 to 0.

Montana Wesleyan Univ. Helena.

Versus Montana State College. (See Montana State College above.)

University of Montana. Missoula.

Versus Montana State College. (See Montana State College above.)

Versus Washington State College, Pullman.

- 1906. At Missoula, Washington Neg. won.
- 1907. At Missoula, Washington Neg. won.
- 1908. At Pullman, Washington Neg. won.
- 1909. At Missoula, Washington Neg. won.
- 1910. At Pullman, Washington Neg. won.
- 1911. At Missoula, Montana Aff. won.
- 1912. At Pullman, Montana Neg. won.
- 1913. At Missoula, Montana Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1914. At Missoula, Montana Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Idaho, Moscow.

- 1905. At Moscow, Idaho Neg. won.
- 1906. Idaho Neg. won.

1906. Idaho Neg. won(?)
 Versus University of N. Dakota, Grand Forks.
 1907. N. Dak. Neg. won(?)
 1915. At Grand Forks, Montana Neg. 3 to 0.
 1916. At Missoula, Montana Neg. 2 to 1.
 Versus Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake City.
 1914. At Salt Lake City, Montana Aff. 3 to 0.
 1915. At Missoula, Montana Aff. 3 to 0.
 1916. At Salt Lake City, Utah Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Univ. of Oregon, Eugene.
 1915. Oregon won 2 to 1.
 1916. At Missoula, Montana 3 to 0.
 Versus Univ. of So. Calif. Law School, Los Angeles, Calif.
 1916. At Los Angeles, Montana Aff. 2 to 1.
 Versus Gonzaga Univ., Spokane, Wash.
 1914. At Spokane, Montana Univ. Neg. 3 to 0.
 1915. At Missoula, Gonzaga Neg. 2 to 1.

NEBRASKA

Bellevue College. Bellevue.

- Versus Cotner College, Bethany, Nebr.
 1911. At Bellevue, Cotner won.
 1912. At Bethany, Cotner won.
 1913. At Bellevue, Cotner Neg. 2 to 1.
 1914. At Bethany, Bellevue Neg. 3 to 0.
 1915. At Bellevue, Cotner Neg. 3 to 0.
 1916. At Bethany, Bellevue Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Doane College, Crete, Nebr.

1911. At Crete. No report.
 1912. At Bellevue, Doane Neg. won.
 1913. At Crete, Bellevue Neg. 2 to 1.
 1914. At Bellevue, Doane Neg. 3 to 0.
 1915. At Crete, Bellevue defaulted.
 1916. At Bellevue, Doane Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Nebraska Wesleyan, University Place.

1916. At Bellevue, Bellevue Neg. 2 to 1.
 At University Place, Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

Cotner College. Bethany.

- Versus Bellevue College, Nebr. (See Bellevue above.)

Versus Doane College, Crete, Nebr.

- 1911. At Bethany, Cotner won.
- 1912. At Crete, Cotner won.
- 1913. At Bethany, Cotner Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Crete, Cotner Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Bethany, Cotner Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Crete, Doane Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Canton Christian College, Canton, Mo.

- 1911. At Canton, Cotner Aff. won.
- 1912. At Bethany, Cotner Neg. won.

Versus Nebraska Wesleyan Univ., University Place, Nebr.

- 1916. At University Place, Nebr. Wesleyan Aff. 2 to 1.

Creighton University. Omaha.

Versus University of S. Dakota, Vermillion.

- 1911. S. Dak. Neg. won.
- 1912. At Omaha, S. Dak. Aff. won.
- 1913. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 3 to 0.

Doane College. Crete.

Versus Bellevue College, Nebr. (See Bellevue above.)

Versus Cotner College, Nebr. (See Cotner College above.)

Versus Nebraska Wesleyan Univ., University Place.

- 1915. At University Place, Nebr. Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Midland College, Atchinson, Kansas.

- 1916. At Atchinson, Doane Aff. 3 to 0.

Grand Island College. Grand Island.

Versus Kearney State Normal, Kearney, Nebr.

- 1911. At Grand Island, Grand Island Aff. won.
- 1912. At Kearney, Kearney Normal Neg. won.
- 1916. At Grand Island, Grand Island Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Hastings College, Hastings, Nebr.

- 1911. Decision not reported.
- 1915. At Hastings, Grand Island Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Hastings, Grand Island Neg. 2 to 1.

Hastings College. Hastings.

Versus Grand Island College, Nebr. (See Grand Island College above.)

Versus Kearney State Normal, Kearney, Nebr.

- 1916. At Kearney, Hastings Aff. 2 to 1.

Kearney State Normal. Kearney.

Versus Grand Island Coll., Nebr. (See Grand Island Coll. above.)

Versus Peru State Normal, Peru, Nebr.

1912. At Kearney, Kearney Aff. won.

1913. At Peru, Kearney Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Hastings College, Nebr. (See Hastings Coll. above.)

Versus Wayne State Normal, Wayne, Nebr.

1912. At Wayne, Wayne Aff. won.

1913. At Kearney, Wayne Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus York College, York, Nebr. (See York Coll. below.)

Nebraska Wesleyan University. University Place.

Versus Washburn College, Topeka, Kans. (See under Kansas.)

Versus Baker University, Baldwin, Kans. (See under Kansas.)

Versus Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia. (See under Iowa.)

Versus S. Dakota Wesleyan Univ., Mitchell, S. Dak.

1912. S. Dakota won.

Versus Yankton College, Yankton, S. Dak.

1914. At University Place, Yankton Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Wm. Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. (See under Missouri.)

Versus Doane College, Nebr. (See Doane College above.)

Versus Cotner College, Nebr. (See Cotner above.)

Versus Bellevue Coll., Nebr. (See Bellevue Coll. above.)

Omaha University. Omaha.

Versus York College, York, Nebr.

1911. At Omaha, York Coll. Neg. won.

Peru State Normal. Peru.

Versus Missouri State Normal, Warrensburg, Mo. (See under Missouri.)

Versus Kearney State Normal, Nebr. (See Kearney Normal above.)

Versus Wayne State Normal, Wayne, Nebr.

1912. At Peru, Peru Aff. won.

1913. At Wayne, Peru Neg. 3 to 0.

University of Nebraska. Lincoln.

Versus University of Illinois, Urbana.

1911. Nebraska Neg. 2 to 1.

1913. At Lincoln, Nebraska Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Wisconsin, Madison.

1911. No report.

1913. At Madison, Nebraska Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Iowa, Iowa City.

1912. No report.

1914. At Iowa City, Nebraska Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

1912. Minnesota won.

1914. At Lincoln, Nebr. Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Kansas, Lawrence.

1916. At Lincoln, Nebraska Aff. 2 to 1.

At Lawrence, Nebraska Neg. 2 to 1.

Wayne State Normal. Wayne.

Versus Kearney State Normal, Nebr. (See Kearney Normal above.)

Versus Peru State Normal, Nebr. (See Peru Normal above.)

York College. York.

Versus Omaha University, Omaha, Nebr. (See Omaha above.)

Versus Kearney State Normal, Kearney, Nebr.

1911. At Kearney, York Aff. won.

Versus Campbell College, Holton, Kansas.

1911. At Holton, York Neg. won.

1912. At York, York Neg. won.

NEVADA

University of Nevada. Reno.

Versus Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

1914. At Reno, Brigham Young Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Provo, Brigham Young Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Reno, Brigham Young Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus College of the Pacific, San José, Calif.

1916. At San José, Nevada Aff. 2 to 1.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College. Hanover.

Versus Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. (See under Mass.)

Versus Brown University, Providence, R. I.

1911. Brown Aff. won.

1912. No report.

1913. No report.

1914-15. No report.

1916. At Hanover, Dartmouth Neg. 2 to 1.

NEW JERSEY

Princeton University. Princeton.

Versus Harvard Univ., Mass. (See under Mass.)

Versus Yale Univ., Conn. (See under Conn.)

Rutgers College. New Brunswick.

Versus Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

1912. At New Brunswick, Lafayette won.

1913. At Easton, Rutgers Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At New Brunswick, Rutgers Neg. 2 to 1.
At Easton, Lafayette Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

1913. At New Brunswick, Rutgers Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus New York University, New York City.

1915. At New York City, N. Y. U. Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At New Brunswick, N. Y. U. Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

1915. At New Brunswick. No report.

1916. At Hartford, Rutgers Neg. 3 to 0.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico State College. State College.

Versus University of N. Mexico, Albuquerque.

1912. State College won.

1914. At Albuquerque, Univ. of N. Mex. Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At State College, Univ. of N. Mex. Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Albuquerque, Univ. of Redlands, Neg. 3 to 0.

University of New Mexico. Albuquerque.

Versus N. Mexico State College. (See State College above.)

Versus University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.

1916. At Albuquerque, Univ. of Redlands, Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of S. California Law School, Los Angeles, Calif.

1916. At Albuquerque, Univ. of N. Mex. Aff. 2 to 1.

NEW YORK

Colgate University. Hamilton.

Versus Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

1910. Hamilton Neg. won.

1911. Colgate won.

1912. Colgate won.

1913. At Hamilton, Colgate Neg. won.

Versus Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

1910. Colgate Neg. won.

1911. Colgate won.

1912. Colgate won.

1913. At Schenectady, Colgate Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Bates College, Lewiston, Me. (See under Maine.)

Versus University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.

1912. At Hamilton, Rochester Aff. won.

1914. At Hamilton. No report.

1915. At Rochester, Rochester Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Rochester, Rochester Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus St. Lawrence Univ., Canton, N. Y.

1913. At Hamilton, Colgate Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Hamilton, Colgate Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Canton, Colgate Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

1914. At Delaware, Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1. (Triangular with Rochester.)

1915. At Hamilton, Colgate Aff. 2 to 1.

At Delaware, Ohio Wesleyan Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Hamilton, Colgate Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Clark College, Mass. (See under Mass.)

Versus Washington and Jefferson, Washington, Pa.

1916. At Washington, Colgate Aff. 3 to 0.
 Versus University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
 1916. At Hamilton, Colgate Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 1916. At Hamilton, Cornell Aff. 2 to 1.
College of the City of New York. New York City.
 Versus Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 1912. Johns Hopkins Aff. won.
 College of City of New York Aff. won.
Columbia University. New York City.
 Versus Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Previous to 1911 Columbia has won 6 and Cornell 6.
 1911. At New York City, Cornell Neg. won.
 1912. At Ithaca, Cornell won.
 1913. At New York City, Columbia Aff. 3 to 0.
 1914. At Ithaca, Columbia Neg. 3 to 0.
 1915. At New York City, Cornell Neg. 2 to 1.
 Versus University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
 1911-12. No report.
 1913. At Philadelphia, Columbia Neg. 3 to 0.
 1914. At New York, Pennsylvania Neg. 3 to 0.
 1915. At Philadelphia, Columbia Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
 1912. At Syracuse, Syracuse Aff. won.
 Versus William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.
 1916. At Liberty, Wm. Jewell Aff. 2 to 1.
 Versus University of Southern California Law School, Los Angeles.
 1916. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. Law Aff. 3 to 0.
Cornell University. Ithaca.
 Versus Columbia University, New York. (See Columbia Univ. above.)
 Versus University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
 1911. Cornell Aff. won.
 1912. Cornell won.
 1913. At Ithaca, Pennsylvania Neg. 3 to 0.
 1914. At Philadelphia, Cornell Neg. 2 to 1.
 1915. At Ithaca, Pennsylvania Neg. 2 to 1.
 Previous to 1911 Cornell won 7, Pennsylvania 8.

Versus Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

1911. Union Coll. Aff. won.

1912. At Schenectady, Union Neg. won.

1913. At Schenectady, Cornell Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Schenectady, Cornell Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.

1911. Cornell Neg. won.

1913. At Rochester, Cornell Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

1912. At Clinton, Hamilton Aff. won.

Versus St. Lawrence Univ., Canton, N. Y.

1913. At Canton, St. Lawrence Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Washington and Jefferson Coll., Washington, Pa.

1913. At Washington, Cornell Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Georgetown College, Washington, D. C.

1913. At Washington, D. C., Georgetown Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

1914. At Syracuse, Syracuse Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Syracuse, Syracuse Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Syracuse, Cornell Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus George Washington Univ., Washington, D. C.

1914. Cornell Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

1916. At Hamilton, Cornell Aff. 2 to 1.

Fordham University. Fordham.

Versus Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass. (See under Mass.)

Versus Boston College, Boston, Mass. (See under Mass.)

Hamilton College. Clinton.

Versus Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. (See Colgate above.)

Versus Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

1911. No report.

1912. Union Neg. won.

1913. At Clinton, Hamilton Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Cornell University, N. Y. (See Cornell Univ. above.)

Versus Bowdoin College, Me.

1913. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Aff. 3 to 0.

- 1914. At Clinton, Hamilton Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Brunswick, Bowdoin Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Clinton, Hamilton Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Wesleyan Univ., Conn.

- 1913. At Clinton, Hamilton Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Middletown, Wesleyan Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Clinton, Hamilton Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Middletown, Hamilton Aff. 3 to 0.

New York University. New York City.

Versus Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.

- 1912. A New York, New York Univ. Aff. won.

Versus Wesleyan Univ., Middletown, Conn.

- 1911. New York Aff. won.

Versus Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

- 1913. At Syracuse, Syracuse Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

- 1915. At Hartford, New York Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At New York, Trinity Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. (See under New Jersey.)

St. Lawrence University. Canton.

Versus Colgate University, N. Y. (See Colgate Univ. above.)

Versus Cornell University, N. Y. (See Cornell Univ. above.)

Syracuse University. Syracuse.

Versus Columbia University, N. Y. (See Columbia Univ. above.)

Versus New York University, N. Y. (See New York Univ. above.)

Versus Cornell Univ., N. Y. (See Cornell Univ. above.)

Versus Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (See under Conn.)

Versus Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia, Pa.

- 1914. At Syracuse, Pennsylvania Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Philadelphia, Syracuse Aff. 3 to 0.

Union College. Schenectady.

Versus Colgate University, N. Y. (See Colgate Univ. above.)

Versus Cornell Univ., N. Y. (See Cornell Univ. above.)

Versus Hamilton College, N. Y. (See Hamilton above.)

University of Rochester. Rochester.

Versus Cornell University, N. Y. (See Cornell Univ. above.)

Versus Colgate Univ., N. Y. (See Colgate Univ. above.)

Versus Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.

1914. At Rochester, Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. Rochester Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Delaware, Ohio Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.

1915. At Meadville, Rochester Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

1916. At Oberlin, Oberlin Neg. 2 to 1.

NORTH CAROLINA

Davidson College. Davidson.

Versus Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C.

1911. At Greensboro, Wake Forest Aff. won.

1913. At Winston, N. C., Davidson Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Winston-Salem, N. C., Davidson Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.

1912. At Charlotte, N. C., Davidson Neg. won.

Versus University of S. Carolina, Columbia.

1912. At Rock Hill, S. C., S. Carolina Neg. won.

1914. At Charlotte, N. C., S. Carolina Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Clemson Agri. College, Clemson, S. C.

1915. At Winthrop Coll., Rock Hill, S. C., Davidson Aff.
4 to 1.

Versus Emory College, Oxford, Ga.

1915. At Agnes Scott Coll., Decatur, Ga., Davidson Aff.
2 to 1.

1916. At Decatur, Ga., Davidson Aff. 4 to 1.

Versus Erskine College, Due West, S. C.

1916. At Winthrop Coll., Rock Hill, S. C., Davidson Neg.
3 to 0.

N. Carolina Agricultural College. West Raleigh.

Versus University of Georgia. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Alabama Polytechnic Institute. (See under Alabama.)

Shaw University. Raleigh.

Versus Union University.

1912. At Richmond, Va., Union Univ. Aff. won.

Trinity College. Durham.

Versus Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

1912. At Swarthmore, Trinity Neg. won.

1913. At Durham, Trinity Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Swarthmore, Swarthmore Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Durham, Trinity Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of S. Carolina, Columbia.

1912. At Durham, S. Carolina Neg. won.

1913. At Columbia, Trinity Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Durham, Trinity Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Washington and Lee Univ., Lexington, Va.

1915. At Lexington, Washington and Lee Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Durham, Trinity Aff. 2 to 1.

University of N. Carolina. Chapel Hill.

Versus University of Georgia, Athens.

1897. Georgia won.

1898. N. Carolina won.

1899. N. Carolina won.

1900. N. Carolina won.

1901. Georgia won.

1902. Georgia won.

1904. N. Carolina won.

1905. Georgia won.

1906. N. Carolina won.

1907. N. Carolina won.

1908. N. Carolina won.

1909. Georgia won.

1910. N. Carolina won.

1911. At Chapel Hill, N. Carolina won.

Versus Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

1900. N. Carolina won.

1901. N. Carolina won.

1902. N. Carolina won.

1912. N. Carolina won.

Versus Washington and Lee Univ., Lexington, Va.

1905. Washington and Lee won.

1910. N. Carolina won.

Versus University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

1907. Pennsylvania won.

1908. N. Carolina won.

1909. N. Carolina won.

1910. N. Carolina won.

1911. N. Carolina won.

Versus George Washington University, Washington,
D. C.

1907. George Washington won.

1908. N. Carolina won.

Versus Tulane University, New Orleans, La.

1909. N. Carolina won.

1912. N. Carolina won.

Versus Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

1902. N. Carolina won.

1903. N. Carolina won.

1913. At Charlottesville, Va., N. Carolina Aff. 3 to 2.

1914. At Charlottesville, Va., Johns Hopkins 5 to 0.

1915. At Charlottesville, Va., Johns Hopkins Aff. 5 to 0.

1916. At Charlottesville, Va., Johns Hopkins Aff. 5 to 0.

Versus University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

1907. N. Carolina won.

1908. N. Carolina won.

1909. Virginia won.

1913. At Baltimore, N. Carolina Neg. 3 to 2.

1914. At Baltimore, Virginia Aff. 3 to 2.

1915. At Baltimore, N. Carolina Aff. 5 to 0.

1916. At Baltimore, N. Carolina Aff. 5 to 0.

Wake Forest College. Wake Forest.

Versus Davidson College, N. C. (See Davidson Coll.
above.)

Versus Baylor Univ., Waco, Texas.

1912. At Waco, Baylor Neg. won.

Versus Richmond College, Richmond, Va.

1915. At Wake Forest, Wake Forest Aff. 3 to 0.

At Richmond, Wake Forest Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Raleigh, N. C., Wake Forest Aff. 3 to 0.
At Richmond, Wake Forest Neg. 3 to 0.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fargo College. Fargo.

Versus St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn. (See under Minnesota.)

Versus St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn.

1911. At St. Paul, St. Thomas Neg. won.

Versus Macalester College, Minn. (See under Minn.)

Versus University of N. Dakota, Grand Forks.

1913. At Fargo, Fargo Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Grand Forks, N. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Fargo, Fargo Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Manitoba, Canada.

1913. At Winnipeg. No report.

1914. At Fargo, Fargo Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Huron College, Huron, S. Dakota.

1915. At Huron, Huron Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Jamestown College, N. D.

1916. At Fargo, Jamestown Neg. 2 to 1.

At Jamestown, Fargo Neg. 3 to 0.

Jamestown College. Jamestown.

Versus Fargo College, N. D. (See Fargo Coll. above.)

N. Dakota Agricultural College. Fargo.

Versus University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Can.

1914. Decision not reported.

Versus S. Dakota Agri. College, Brookings.

1914. At Fargo, S. Dakota Neg. 2 to 1.

At Brookings, S. Dak. Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Fargo, N. Dak. Aff. 3 to 0.

At Brookings, S. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of S. California, Los Angeles.

1914. At Los Angeles, N. Dak. 2 to 1.

1915. At Fargo, N. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Montana State College, Bozeman.

1916. At Bozeman, Montana State Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Oregon Agri. College, Corvallis.

1916. At Fargo, N. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

At Corvallis, N. Dak. Neg. 2 to 1.

University of N. Dakota. Grand Forks.

Versus University of S. Dakota, Vermillion.

1911. N. Dak. Aff. won.

1912. At Vermillion, N. Dak. Neg. won.

Versus University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

1911. At Winnipeg, N. Dak. Aff. won.

1912. At Grand Forks, N. Dak. Neg. won.

1913. At Grand Forks, N. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Winnipeg, N. Dak. Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Winnipeg, N. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Grand Forks, Univ. of Manitoba Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak. (See Fargo Coll. above.)

Versus University of Montana, Missoula.

1915. At Grand Forks, Montana Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Missoula, Montana Neg. 2 to 1.

OHIO

Ashland College. Ashland.

Versus Otterbein University, Westerville, O.

1912. At Westerville, Otterbein Neg. won.

1913. At Ashland, Otterbein Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Findlay College, Findlay, O.

1913. At Findlay, Ashland Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Ashland, Findlay Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, O.

1914. At Ashland, Ashland Aff. 3 to 0.

Baldwin-Wallace College. Berea.

Versus Ashland College, Ohio. (See Ashland Coll. above.)

Versus Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio.

1914. At Berea, Hiram Neg. 2 to 1.

At Hiram, Hiram Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. No report.

1916. At Hiram, Hiram Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Heidelberg University, Tiffin, O.

1910. Heidelberg won.

1915. At Tiffin, Heidelberg Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Berea, Heidelberg Neg. 2 to 1.
Buchtel College. Akron. (Discontinued.)

Versus Heidelberg University, Tiffin, O.

1911. Heidelberg Aff. won.

Versus Otterbein College, Westerville, O.

1911. No report.

Denison University. Granville.

Versus Ohio Wesleyan Univ., Delaware, O.

1911. At Granville, Denison Neg. 3 to 0.

1912. At Delaware, Ohio Wesleyan Neg. won.

Versus University of Cincinnati, Ohio.

1911. At Granville, Denison Neg. won.

1915. At Granville, Denison Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

1912. Denison Neg. won.

1913. At Oxford, Miami Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Granville, Denison Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

1913. At Granville, Denison Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Athens, Ohio Univ. Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Athens, Denison Neg. 2 to 1.

At Granville, Ohio Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Athens, Denison Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Otterbein Univ., Westerville.

1914. (Women's Debate or Shepardson College.) At
 Granville, Otterbein Aff. 3 to 0.

At Westerville, Shepardson 2 to 1.

Versus Heidelberg Univ., Ohio. (See Heidelberg Univ. below.)

Versus Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio.

1916. At Granville, Denison Neg. 3 to 0.

At Marietta, Denison Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio.

1916. At Granville, Denison Aff. 2 to 1.

At Wooster, Wooster Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio.

1916. At Granville, Muskingum Aff. 2 to 1.

Findlay College. Findlay.

Versus Ashland College, Ohio. (See Ashland above.)

Heidelberg University. Tiffin.

Versus Buchtel College, Akron, Ohio. (See Buchtel above.)

Versus Otterbein College, Westerville, O.

1907. Dual debate, Heidelberg 1, Otterbein 1.

1908. Heidelberg won. (Triangular including Denison.)

1909. Decision not certain in record. (H. won over Denison or Otterbein and lost one.)

1910. Decision not certain. (Won one, lost one.)

1911. Tie decision, 1 to 1.

1913. At Tiffin, Heidelberg Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Westerville, Heidelberg Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Denison Univ., Granville, Ohio.

1908. Denison won.

1909. Heidelberg won from Denison or Otterbein and lost one.

1910. Heidelberg won from Denison or Otterbein and lost one.

Versus Mt. Union College, Alliance, O.

1913. At Alliance, Heidelberg Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Muskingum College, New Concord, O.

1913. At Tiffin, Heidelberg Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Tiffin, Heidelberg Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, O. (See Baldwin-Wallace above.)

Versus Hiram College, Hiram, O.

1915. At Hiram, Hiram Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Tiffin, Heidelberg Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.

1915. At Tiffin, Heidelberg Neg. 2 to 1.

At Detroit, Heidelberg Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Detroit, Detroit Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.

1916. At Richmond, Heidelberg Aff. 2 to 1.

Hiram College. Hiram.

Versus Mt. Union College, Alliance, Ohio.

1911. At Hiram, Hiram Aff. won.

Versus Baldwin-Wallace, Berea, Ohio. (See Baldwin-Wallace above.)

Versus Heidelberg Univ., Ohio. (See Heidelberg Univ. above.)

Marietta College. Marietta.

Versus West Virginia Wesleyan, Buckhannon.

1913. At Marietta, W. Va. Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.

At Buckhannon, Marietta Aff. 2 to 0.

1914. At Marietta. No report.

1915. At Marietta, Marietta Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va.

1914. At Bethany. No report.

1915. At Bethany, Bethany Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Denison University, Granville, O. (See Denison above.)

Miami University. Oxford.

Versus Denison University, Ohio. (See Denison Univ. above.)

Versus Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

1913. At Athens, Ohio Univ. Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Oxford, Miami Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Ohio Wesleyan Univ., Delaware.

1912. Ohio Wesleyan Neg. won.

Mt. Union College. Alliance.

Versus Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio.

1911. At Alliance, Mt. Union Aff. 3 to 0.

1912. At Alliance, Mt. Union Aff. won.

At New Concord, Muskingum Aff. won.

1913. At New Concord, Muskingum Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Alliance, Muskingum Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus West Virginia Wesleyan, Buckhannon, W. Va.

1911. Mt. Union Aff. won.

Versus Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.

1913. At Mt. Union, Geneva Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Heidelberg University, Tiffin, Ohio. (See Heidelberg above.)

Versus Otterbein University, Westerville, Ohio.

1913. At Westerville, Otterbein Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Alliance. No report.

Versus Ohio Northern Univ., Ada, Ohio.

1914. At Ada. No report.

Versus Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

1914. At Alliance, Mt. Union Aff. 2 to 1.

At Cleveland, Western Reserve Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.

1914. At Springfield, Wittenberg Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Hiram Coll., Ohio. (See Hiram Coll. above.)

Muskingum College. New Concord.

Versus Hiram College, Ohio. (See Hiram College above.)

Versus Mt. Union College, Ohio. (See Mt. Union Coll. above.)

Versus Denison University, Granville, Ohio. (See Denison above.)

Versus Heidelberg Univ., Ohio. (See Heidelberg Univ. above.)

Versus Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.

1911. At Beaver Falls, Geneva Neg. won.

1912. At New Concord, Muskingum Aff. won.

1913. At Beaver Falls, Muskingum Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At New Concord, Muskingum Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

1912. (Women's Debate.) Ohio Univ. Neg. won.

1916. At New Concord. No report.

Versus Otterbein University, Westerville.

1912. Otterbein won. (Women's Debate.)

1913. At New Concord, Otterbein Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At New Concord, Otterbein Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Wittenberg Univ., Springfield, Ohio.

1913. At Springfield, Muskingum Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Ohio Northern Univ., Ada, Ohio.

1914. At New Concord, Muskingum Neg. 3 to 0.

Oberlin College. Oberlin.

Versus Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio.

1911. Oberlin Aff. won.

1912. Wesleyan won.

1913. At Oberlin, Oberlin Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Delaware, Ohio Wesleyan 3 to 0.

1915. At Oberlin. Decision abandoned — no judges.

Versus Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

- 1911. Western Reserve Aff. won.
- 1912. Oberlin won.
- 1913. At Cleveland, Oberlin Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Oberlin, Oberlin Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Cleveland, no judges.

Versus Univ. of Rochester, New York.

- 1916. At Oberlin, Oberlin Neg. 2 to 1.

Ohio Northern University. Ada.

Versus Mt. Union Coll., Ohio. (See Mt. Union above.)

Versus Muskingum Coll., Ohio. (See Muskingum Coll. above.)

Ohio State University. Columbus.

Versus University of Illinois. (See under Illinois.)

Versus University of Indiana. (See under Indiana.)

Ohio University. Athens.

Versus Denison University, Ohio. (See Denison Univ. above.)

Versus Miami University, Ohio. (See Miami Univ. above.)

Versus Muskingum College, Ohio. (See Muskingum Coll. above.)

Versus Otterbein University, Westerville, Ohio.

- 1912. At Athens, Ohio Aff. won.
- (Women's Debate.) Otterbein Neg. won.

Versus Wittenberg Univ., Springfield, O.

- 1912. At Springfield, Wittenberg Aff. won.

Ohio Wesleyan University. Delaware.

Versus Oberlin College, Ohio. (See Oberlin above.)

Versus Denison Univ., Ohio. (See Denison Univ. above.)

Versus Miami University, Oxford, O. (See Miami Univ. above.)

Versus Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

- 1911. Ohio Wesleyan Aff. won.
- 1912. Western Reserve won.
- 1913. At Delaware, Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1914. At Cleveland, Western Reserve Neg. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Delaware, no judges.

Versus University of Cincinnati, Ohio.

- 1913. At Delaware, Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.

1913. At Cincinnati, Wesleyan Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Delaware, Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.

At Cincinnati, Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

1914. At Delaware, Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Delaware, Wesleyan Aff. 2 to 1.

At Hamilton, Colgate Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Hamilton, Colgate Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.

1914. At Rochester, Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Rochester, Rochester Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Delaware, Wesleyan Neg. 2 to 1.

Otterbein University. Westerville.

Versus Ashland College, Ashland, O. (See Ashland Coll. above.)

Versus Buchtel College, Ohio. (See Buchtel Coll. above.)

Versus Denison Univ., Ohio. (See Denison Univ. above.)

Versus Heidelberg Univ., Ohio. (See Heidelberg Univ. above.)

Versus Mt. Union College, Ohio. (See Mt. Union Coll. above.)

Versus Muskingum Coll., Ohio. (See Muskingum Coll. above.)

Versus Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. (See Ohio Univ. above.)

Versus Wittenberg Univ., Springfield, O.

1912. At Westerville, Otterbein Aff. won.

1913. At Westerville, Otterbein Aff. 3 to 0.

1913. At Westerville, Otterbein Neg. 2 to 1.

University of Cincinnati. Cincinnati.

Versus Denison Univ., Ohio. (See Denison Univ. above.)

Versus Ohio Wesleyan Univ. (See Ohio Wesleyan above.)

Versus Earlham College, Indiana. (See under Indiana.)

Western Reserve University. Cleveland.

Versus Oberlin College, Ohio. (See Oberlin Coll. above.)

Versus Ohio Wesleyan Univ., Ohio. (See Ohio Wesleyan Univ. above.)

Versus Univ. of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

1911. Notre Dame Neg. won.

Versus Mt. Union College, Ohio. (See Mt. Union Coll. above.)

Wilberforce University. Wilberforce.

Versus Clark University, Atlanta, Ga.

1910. At Atlanta, Clark Aff. 2 to 1.

1911. At Wilberforce, Wilberforce Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Howard University, Washington, D. C.

1909. At Washington, Wilberforce Aff. 2 to 1.

1910. At Wilberforce, Howard Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Wilberforce, Wilberforce Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Fisk Univ., Nashville, Tenn.

1913. At Nashville, Wilberforce Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Lincoln Univ., Chester, Pa.

1915. At Wilberforce, Wilberforce Neg. 2 to 1.

Wittenberg University. Springfield.

Versus Mt. Union College, Ohio. (See Mt. Union above.)

Versus Muskingum College, Ohio. (See Muskingum Coll. above.)

Versus Ohio University. (See Ohio University above.)

Versus Otterbein University, Ohio. (See Otterbein Univ. above.)

Wooster, University of. Wooster.

Versus Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.

1911. Allegheny Aff. won.

1912. Wooster Aff. won.

1913. At Meadville, Wooster Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Wooster, Wooster Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Meadville, Wooster Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

1911. At Wooster, Wooster Aff. won.

1912. At Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Aff. won.

1913. At Wooster, Wooster Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Pittsburgh, Wooster Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Wooster, Wooster Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

1914. At Wooster, Wooster 2 to 0.

Versus Denison University, Ohio. (See Denison above.)

OKLAHOMA

Central State Normal. Edmond.

Versus Northwestern Normal, Okla. (See Northwestern Normal below.)

Versus Southwestern Normal, Weatherford. No report.

Epworth University. Oklahoma City.

Versus Southwestern College, Kansas.

1911. At Winfield, Southwestern won.

Northwestern Normal. Alva.

Versus Missouri State Normal, Warrensburg. (See under Missouri.)

Versus Central State Normal, Edmond, Okla.

1914. At Edmond, Central Normal Neg. 1 to 0.

Versus Southwestern State Normal, Weatherford.

1914. At Alva, Northwestern Neg. 1 to 0.

Versus Kansas State Normal, Emporia, Kansas.

1914. At Alva, Northwestern Aff. 2 to 1.

At Emporia, Northwestern Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Alva, Northwestern Aff. 1 to 0.

At Emporia, Kansas Normal Aff. 1 to 0.

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. Stillwater.

Versus Kansas State Agricultural Coll. (See under Kansas.)

Versus Colorado Agricultural College. (See under Colorado.)

Versus Oklahoma Methodist Univ., Guthrie, Okla.

1913. At Guthrie, Okla. Methodist Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. Okla. A. & M. Neg. 2 to 1 at Stillwater.

1915. At Guthrie, Okla. Methodist Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Phillips University, Enid, Okla.

1916. At Enid, Phillips Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Okla., Norman.

1916. At Stillwater, Okla. A. & M. Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Southwestern College, Kansas. (See under Kansas.)

Oklahoma Baptist College. Blackwell. (Discontinued.)

Versus Southwestern College, Kansas. (See under Kansas.)

- Versus Oklahoma Methodist Univ., Guthrie.
1913. At Blackwell, Okla. Baptist Aff. 3 to 0.
- Oklahoma Methodist University.** Guthrie.
Versus Okla. A. & M. Coll. (See Okla. A. & M. above.)
Versus Okla. Baptist Coll. (See Okla. Baptist Coll. above.)
Versus Friends University, Wichita, Kansas.
1914. At Guthrie, Okla. Methodist Aff. 2 to 1.
1915. At Wichita, Friends forfeited.
- Phillips University.** Enid.
Versus Friends University, Kansas. (See under Kansas.)
Versus Fairmount College, Kansas. (See under Kansas.)
Versus Southwestern College, Kansas. (See under Kansas.)
Versus Oklahoma A. & M. College. (See above.)
Versus Kingfisher College, Kingfisher, Okla.
1915. At Enid, Phillips Neg. 3 to 0.
- Southwestern Normal.** Weatherford.
Versus Central Normal, Edmond, Okla. (See above.)
Versus Northwestern Normal, Alva. (See above.)
- University of Oklahoma.** Norman.
Versus University of Colorado. (See under Colorado.)
Versus University of Kansas. (See under Kansas.)
Versus University of Missouri.
1911. Missouri Neg. won.
Versus University of Arkansas.
1914. At Fayetteville, Arkansas Neg. 3 to 0.
Versus University of S. California, Los Angeles.
1914. At Norman, U. S. C. Neg. 3 to 0.
Versus Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater. (See above.)
Versus Univ. of Texas, Austin, Texas.
1916. At Austin, Texas Neg. 2 to 1.

OREGON

- Albany College.** Albany.
Versus Williamette, Salem, Ore.
1912. At Albany, Albany won.
Versus Pacific University, Forest Grove, Ore.
1912. At Albany, Albany won.

Versus McMinneville College, McMinneville, Ore.

1913. At Albany, Albany Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Pacific College, Newberg, Ore.

1913. At Newberg, Albany Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Albany, Albany Aff. 2 to 1.

McMinneville College. McMinneville.

Versus Albany College, Oregon. (See above.)

Versus Pacific College. No reports.

Oregon Agricultural College. Corvallis.

Versus Williamette University, Salem, Ore.

1915. Oregon Agri. Coll. Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus N. Dakota Agri. Coll., Fargo.

1916. At Corvallis, N. Dak. Neg. 2 to 1.

At Fargo, N. Dak. Agri. Aff. 2 to 1.

Pacific College. Newberg.

Versus Albany College, Oregon. (See above.)

Versus McMinneville Coll. No report.

Pacific University. Forest Grove.

Versus Albany College, Oregon. (See Albany Coll. above.)

Versus University of Idaho, Moscow.

1911. At Moscow, Pacific Univ. Neg. won.

University of Oregon. Eugene.

Versus Stanford University, Calif. (See under Calif.)

Versus University of Washington, Seattle.

1910. Oregon Neg. 2 to 1.

1910. (Women.) At Seattle, Washington Aff. 2 to 1.

1911. Oregon Aff. 2 to 1. (Women.) Ore. Neg. 3 to 0.

1912. Washington won.

1913. At Eugene, Oregon Aff. 3 to 0. (Women.) Ore.
Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Seattle, Washington Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. No report.

1916. No report.

Versus Univ. of Idaho, Moscow.

1910. Oregon Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake City.

1910. At Eugene, Oregon Aff. 3 to 0.

1911. At Salt Lake City, Utah Neg. 2 to 1.

1912. At Eugene, Utah Neg. won.

1913. At Salt Lake City, Oregon Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus University of Montana, Missoula.

1915. Oregon won 2 to 1.

1916. At Missoula, Montana won 2 to 1.

Willamette University. Salem.

Versus Albany College, Ore. (See Albany Coll. above.)

Versus University of Idaho, Moscow.

1912. At Salem, Idaho Neg. 3 to 0.

At Moscow, Willamette Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Oregon Agri. College, Corvallis.

1915. Oregon Agri. Coll. Neg. 2 to 1.

PENNSYLVANIA

Allegheny College. Meadville.

Versus Univ. of Wooster, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

Versus University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

1912. Pittsburgh Aff. won.

1913. At Pittsburgh, Allegheny Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. No report.

1915. At Pittsburgh, Allegheny Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.

1915. At Meadville, Rochester Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

1916. Canceled.

Bucknell University. Lewisburg.

Versus Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

1916. At Lewisburg, Lafayette Aff. 2 to 1.

At Easton, Lafayette Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg.

1912. At Lewisburg, Bucknell Aff. won.

At Gettysburg, Penn. Coll. Aff. won.

1913. At Lewisburg, Bucknell Aff. 3 to 0.

At Gettysburg, Penn. Coll. Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Lewisburg, Bucknell Neg. 2 to 1.

At Gettysburg, Penn. Coll. Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. No report.

Versus Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.

1916. At Lewisburg, Bucknell Aff. 2 to 1.

At State College, Penn. State Aff. 3 to 0.

Dickinson College. Carlisle.

Versus Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

1911. Dickinson Coll. won.

1913. Franklin and Marshall Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Carlisle, Dickinson Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.

1911. Dickinson Coll. won.

1913. At Carlisle, Dickinson Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At State College, Penn. State Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

1912. At Carlisle, Dickinson Aff. won.

At Swarthmore, Swarthmore Aff. won.

1915. At Carlisle, Dickinson Neg. 3 to 0.

At Swarthmore, Swarthmore Neg. 2 to 1.

Franklin and Marshall College. Lancaster.

Versus Dickinson College, Pennsylvania. (See above.)

Versus Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.

1912. At Lancaster, F. & M. Neg. won.

At State College, Penn. State Neg. won.

1915. No report.

Versus Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

1911. At Lancaster, F. & M. won.

1913. At Swarthmore, Swarthmore Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Lancaster, Swarthmore Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Swarthmore, Swarthmore Neg. 2 to 1.

Geneva College. Beaver Falls.

Versus Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

Versus Mt. Union College, Alliance, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

Versus Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.

1914. At Beaver Falls, Geneva Coll. Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

1915. At Beaver Falls, Geneva Coll. Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.

1915. At New Wilmington, Geneva Neg. 2 to 1.

Grove City College. Grove City.

Versus West Virginia Wesleyan, Buckhannon, W. Va.

1913. At Buckhannon, W. Va. Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Geneva College, Pa. (See Geneva Coll. above.)

Juniata College. Huntingdon.

Versus Westminster College, New Wilmington.

1911. At Huntingdon, Juniata College won on Aff.

Versus University of Pennsylvania.

1912. At Beaver Falls, University Aff. won.

Versus Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa.

1913. At Huntingdon, Juniata Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

1915. Juniata Neg. won.

1916. At Swarthmore, Juniata Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

1916. At Huntingdon, Juniata Aff. won.

Lafayette College. Easton, Pa.

Versus Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. (See under New Jersey.)

Versus Swarthmore College, Pa.

1913. At Swarthmore, Swarthmore Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Easton, Swarthmore Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. (See Bucknell above.)

Lebanon Valley College. Annville.

Versus Juniata College, Pa. (See Juniata above.)

Pennsylvania College. Gettysburg.

Versus Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. (See Bucknell above.)

Pennsylvania State College. State College.

Versus Dickinson College, Pa. (See Dickinson above.)

Versus Franklin & Marshall Coll. (See Franklin and Marshall above.)

Versus Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

1911. Swarthmore won.

1913. At State College, Penn. State Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Swarthmore, Penn. State Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At State College, Penn. State Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

1915. At Pittsburgh, Penn. State Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Washington and Jefferson Coll., Washington, Pa.

1915. At State College, Penn. State Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.

1915. At State College, Penn. State Neg. 2 to 1.

Swarthmore College. Swarthmore.

Versus Dickinson College, Pa. (See Dickinson above.)

Versus Franklin and Marshall Coll., Pa. (See Franklin and Marshall above.)

Versus Pennsylvania State College, Pa. (See Penn. State above.)

Versus Juniata College, Pa. (See Juniata Coll. above.)

Versus Lafayette College, Pa. (See Lafayette Coll. above.)

Versus Trinity College, Durham, N. C. (See under N. Carolina.)

Versus University of Pennsylvania.

1912. At Philadelphia, Swarthmore Aff. won.

Versus Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.

1913. At New Wilmington, Swarthmore Neg. 2 to 1.

University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia.

Versus Cornell University, N. Y. (See under N. Y.)

Versus Columbia University, N. Y. (See under N. Y.)

Versus Juniata College, Pa. (See Juniata above.)

Versus Swarthmore College, Pa. (See Swarthmore above.)

Versus Tulane University, New Orleans, La.

1914. At Philadelphia, Tulane Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At New Orleans, Pennsylvania Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Syracuse University, N. Y. (See under N. Y.)

Versus Colgate University, N. Y. (See under N. Y.)

University of Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh.

Versus University of Wooster, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

Versus Allegheny College, Pa. (See Allegheny Coll. above.)

Versus Pennsylvania State College, Pa. (See Penn. State above.)

Versus Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.

1914. At New Wilmington, Westminster Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa. (See Geneva Coll. above.)

Versus Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.

1915. At Washington, Washington & Jefferson Aff. 2 to 1.

Washington and Jefferson. Washington.

Versus Pennsylvania State College. (See Penn. State above.)

Versus University of Pittsburgh, Pa. (See Univ. of Pittsburgh above.)

Versus Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

1913. Cornell won 3 to 0.

Versus Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.

1915. At New Wilmington, Washington & Jefferson Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. (See under New York.)

Westminster College. New Wilmington.

Versus Bethany College, W. Va.

1912. At Bethany, Westminster Aff. won.

Versus Geneva College, Pa. (See Geneva Coll. above.)

Versus Juniata College, Pa. (See Juniata Coll. above.)

Versus Pennsylvania State College. (See Penn. State above.)

Versus Swarthmore Coll., Pa. (See Swarthmore above.)

Versus University of Pittsburgh, Pa. (See Univ. of Pittsburgh above.)

Versus Washington and Jefferson Univ., Pa. (See above.)

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University. Providence.

Versus Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

1911. Williams Aff. won.

1912. No report.

1913. At Williamstown, Brown Aff. 2 to 1.

1914-15. No report.

1916. At Providence, Brown Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

1911. Brown Aff. won.

1912. No report.

1913. At Providence. No report.

1914-15. No report.

1916. At Hanover, Dartmouth Neg. 2 to 1.

Rhode Island State College. Kingston.

Versus Massachusetts Agri. College, Amherst.

1910. At Kingston, Mass. Agri. Neg. won.

1911. At Amherst, Mass. Agri. Neg. won.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clemson Agri. College. Clemson College.

Versus Davidson College, N. Carolina. (See under N. Carolina.)

Versus College of Charleston, S. Carolina.

1915. At Charleston, Charleston Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Clemson College, Charleston won.

Versus Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. Carolina.

1915. At Clemson College, Wofford Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Spartanburg, decision not reported.

College of Charleston. Charleston.

Versus Clemson Agri. College, S. C. (See Clemson above.)

Versus Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.

1915. At Spartanburg, Charleston Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Charleston, Wofford Neg. won.

Furman University. Greenville.

Versus Emory College, Oxford, Ga. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Mercer University, Macon, Ga. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Wofford College, S. C. (See Wofford below.)

University of S. Carolina. Columbia.

Versus Davidson College, N. C. (See under N. Carolina.)

Versus Trinity College, N. C. (See under N. Carolina.)

Versus Univ. of Georgia, Athens, Ga. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville.

1915. At Athens, Ga., Tenn. Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Athens, Ga., S. Carolina Neg. 4 to 1.

Wofford College. Spartanburg.

Versus Davidson College, N. C. (See under N. Carolina.)

Versus Emory College, Ga. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va.

1914. At Emory, Emory and Henry Aff. 3 to 0.
 Versus College of Charleston, S. C. (See Charleston
 above.)
 Versus Clemson College, S. C. (See Clemson Coll. above.)
 Versus Furman University, S. C.
 1915. At Greenville, Wofford Neg. 4 to 1.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College. Canton.

- Versus Waldorf College, Forest City, Ia.
 1911. At Forest City, Augustana Aff. won.
 1916. At Canton, Waldorf Neg. 2 to 1. (Academy de-
 bate.)
 Versus St. Olaf Coll., Northfield, Minn.
 1916. At Northfield, St. Olaf Aff. 3 to 0.

Dakota Wesleyan University. Mitchell.

- Versus Yankton College, Yankton, S. Dak.
 1911. At Mitchell, Yankton Neg. won.
 1915. At Yankton, Dak. Wesleyan Aff. 2 to 1.
 1916. At Mitchell, Dak. Wesleyan Neg. 3 to 0.
 Versus Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia. (See under
 Iowa.)
 Versus Nebraska Wesleyan, University Place, Nebr. (See
 under Nebr.)
 Versus Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. (See under
 Minn.)

Versus Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.

1913. At Mitchell, Ripon Neg. 3 to 0.
 1914. At Ripon, Ripon Aff. 3 to 0.
 Versus Huron College, Huron, S. Dak.
 1915. At Mitchell, Dak. Wesleyan Neg. 3 to 0.
 1916. At Huron, Huron Neg. 2 to 1.
 Versus St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.
 1916. At Mitchell, Dak. Wesleyan Aff. 2 to 1.

Huron College. Huron.

- Versus Yankton College, Yankton, S. Dak.
 1911. At Yankton, Yankton Aff. won.
 1912. At Huron, Yankton Neg. won.
 1913. At Huron, Yankton Aff. 2 to 1.

- 1914. At Yankton, Yankton Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Huron, Yankton Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1916. At Yankton, Yankton Neg. 3 to 0.
- Versus So. Dakota State College, Brookings.
- 1912. At Huron, Huron Neg. won.
- 1913. At Huron, Huron Aff. 2 to 1.
- At Brookings, State Coll. Aff. 2 to 1.
- 1914. At Huron, Huron Aff. 2 to 1.
- At Brookings, Huron Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Huron, Huron Aff. 3 to 0.
- At Brookings, S. Dak. State Coll. 2 to 1.
- Versus Northern Normal, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
- 1914. At Aberdeen, Northern Normal Aff. 3 to 0.
- 1915. At Huron, Huron Neg. 3 to 0.
- Versus Dakota Wesleyan. (See Dakota Wesleyan above.)
- Versus Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.
- 1915. At St. Paul, Macalester Neg. 3 to 0.
- Versus Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak.
- 1915. At Huron, Huron Neg. 3 to 0.
- Versus Univ. of S. Dakota (Women's Debate).
- 1916. At Vermillion, Huron Neg. 3 to 0.
- Versus Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia.
- 1916. (Women.) At Huron, Morningside Neg. 2 to 1.
- South Dakota Agricultural College. Brookings.**
- Versus Huron College, S. Dak. (See Huron College above.)
- Versus Yankton College, Yankton, S. Dak.
- 1912. At Yankton, Yankton Aff. won.
- Versus N. Dakota Agri. Coll., Fargo.
- 1914. At Brookings, S. Dak. Aff. 3 to 0.
- At Fargo, S. Dak. Neg. 2 to 1.
- 1915. At Brookings, S. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.
- At Fargo, N. Dak. Aff. 3 to 0.
- Versus Montana State Agri. Coll., Bozeman.
- 1916. At Brookings, Montana Neg. 3 to 0.
- S. Dakota Northern Normal. Aberdeen.**
- Versus Huron College, S. Dak. (See Huron Coll. above.)
- Versus Madison Normal, Madison, S. Dak.
- 1916. At Madison, Madison Neg. 3 to 0.

S. Dakota, Madison Normal. Madison.

Versus Northern Normal, S. Dak. (See S. Dak. Northern Normal.)

University of S. Dakota. Vermillion.

Versus Univ. of N. Dakota, Grand Forks.

1911. N. Dak. Aff. won.

1912. At Vermillion, N. Dak. Neg. won.

Versus University of Colorado, Boulder.

1911. S. Dak. Neg. won.

Versus Univ. of Denver, Colorado.

1911. S. Dak. Neg. won.

1912. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. won.

Versus Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr.

1911. S. Dak. Neg. won.

1912. At Omaha, S. Dak. Aff. won.

1913. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Drake University, Des Moines, Ia.

1912. At Des Moines, Drake Neg. won.

1913. At Vermillion, Drake Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Des Moines, Drake Aff. 5 to 0.

1915. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 4 to 1.

Versus Yankton College, Yankton, S. Dak.

1913. (Women.) At Vermillion, S. Dak. Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Yankton, Yankton Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.

1914. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 5 to 0.

1915. At Grinnell, S. Dak. Neg. 5 to 0.

Versus Iowa State College, Ames.

1914. At Ames, S. Dak. Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Ames, S. Dak. Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Kansas State Agri. College, Manhattan.

1914. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Manhattan, S. Dak. Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Vermillion, S. Dak. Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.

1915. At Vermillion, Macalester Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia. (See under Iowa.)

Versus Huron College, S. Dak. (See Huron Coll. above.)
Yankton College. Yankton.

Versus Dakota Wesleyan, S. Dak. (See Dakota Wesleyan above.)

Versus Huron College, S. Dak. (See Huron College above.)

Versus S. Dak. State College, Brookings. (See S. Dak. State above.)

Versus University of S. Dakota, Vermillion. (See Univ. of S. Dak.)

Versus William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.

1913. At Yankton, William Jewell Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.

1914. At Yankton, Yankton Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Nebraska Wesleyan, Univ. Place, Nebr.

1914. At University Place, Yankton Neg. 3 to 0.

TENNESSEE

Carson and Newman College. Jefferson City.

Versus Maryville College, Maryville, Tenn.

1913. At Jefferson City, Carson & Newman Aff. 3 to 0.
At Maryville, Carson and Newman Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Tusculum College.

1914. At Jefferson City, Carson and Newman Aff. 2 to 1.

Fisk University. Nashville.

Versus Wilberforce University, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

Versus Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Howard University, Washington, D. C. (See under District of Col.)

Knoxville College. Knoxville.

Versus Talladega College, Alabama. (See under Alabama.)

Versus Atlanta Baptist College, Ga. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Morehouse College, Ga. (See under Georgia.)

Maryville College. Maryville.

Versus Carson and Newman Coll., Tenn. (See above.)

Union College. Jackson.

Versus Ouachita College, Arkansas. (See under Arkansas.)

University of Tennessee. Knoxville.

Versus Univ. of Arkansas. Fayetteville.

1911. Arkansas won.

1913. At Fayetteville, Arkansas Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Fayetteville, Arkansas Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Texas, Austin.

1911. Texas won.

1913. At Nashville, Tennessee Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Cincinnati, Ohio.

1911. Cincinnati Aff. won.

Versus Univ. of Louisiana, Baton Rouge. (See under Louisiana.)

Versus University of Mississippi. (See under Mississippi.)

Versus University of Georgia. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Univ. of S. Carolina. (See under S. Carolina.)

Versus Washington and Lee Univ., Lexington, Va.

1915. At Knoxville, Washington and Lee Neg. 2 to 1.

University of the South. Sewanee.

Versus University of Alabama. (See under Alabama.)

Vanderbilt University. Nashville.

Versus Tulane University, New Orleans, La. (See under Louisiana.)

Versus University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

1911. Vanderbilt won.

Versus Univ. of Georgia. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Univ. of N. Carolina. (See under N. Carolina.)

Versus University of Alabama. (See under Alabama.)

Versus University of Kentucky, Lexington.

1914. At Lexington, Kentucky Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Nashville, Vanderbilt Aff. 2 to 1.

TEXAS

Baylor University. Waco.

Versus Wm. Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. (See under Missouri.)

Versus Wake Forest College, N. Carolina. (See under N. Carolina.)

Versus Ouachita College, Arkansas. (See under Arkansas.)

Versus Mercer University, Georgia. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas.

1913. At Waco, Baylor Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Waco, Baylor Neg. 3 to 0.

1916. At Georgetown, Baylor Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Louisiana State University. (See under Louisiana.)

Versus Southern Methodist University, Dallas.

1916. At Waco. Decision not reported.

Daniel Baker College. Brownwood.

Versus Trinity College, Waxahachie. (See Trinity below.)

Versus Southwestern University, Texas. (See Southwestern below.)

Southern Methodist Univ. Dallas.

Versus Baylor University, Texas. (See Baylor above.)

Versus Louisiana State University. (See under Louisiana.)

Southwestern University. Georgetown.

Versus Texas Christian University, Ft. Worth.

1913. At Fort Worth, Texas Christian Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Georgetown. Decision not reported.

Versus Baylor University, Texas. (See Baylor Univ. above.)

Versus Trinity College, Waxahachie, Texas.

1913. At Georgetown, Southwestern Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Waxahachie, Trinity Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Georgetown, Southwestern Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Waxahachie, Trinity Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Daniel Baker College, Brownwood, Texas.

1915. No report.

Texas Christian College. Ft. Worth.

Versus Southwestern Univ., Texas. (See Southwestern above.)

Versus Trinity College, Waxahachie, Texas.

1913. At Waxahachie, Trinity Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Ft. Worth, Trinity Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Waxahachie, Trinity Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At Ft. Worth. No report.

Versus Daniel Baker Coll. No report.

Trinity College. Waxahachie.

Versus Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas. (See Southwestern above.)

Versus Texas Christian College, Ft. Worth. (See Texas Christian Coll.)

Versus Daniel Baker College, Brownwood, Texas.

1915. At Brownwood, Trinity Neg. 2 to 1.

University of Texas. Austin.

Versus Univ. of Tennessee. (See under Tennessee.)

Versus Univ. of Mississippi. (See under Mississippi.)

Versus University of Missouri. (See under Missouri.)

Versus Univ. of Arkansas. (See under Arkansas.)

Versus University of Louisiana. (See under Louisiana.)

Versus University of Colorado. (See under Colorado.)

Versus Oklahoma University. (See under Oklahoma.)

Versus Univ. of Arizona, Tucson.

1916. At Tucson, Texas Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Univ. of S. California, Los Angeles.

1916. At Los Angeles, Texas Neg. 3 to 0.

UTAH

Brigham Young University. Provo.

Versus University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

1914. At Salt Lake City, University Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. At Provo, Brigham Young Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Salt Lake City. Decision not reported.

Versus Utah Agricultural College. Logan.

1912. At Provo, Utah Agri. Aff. won.

1914. At Provo, Brigham Young Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Logan, Brigham Young 1 to 0.

1916. At Provo, Utah Agri. Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Nevada, Reno.

1914. At Reno, Brigham Young Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Provo, Brigham Young Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Reno, Brigham Young Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of S. California, Los Angeles.

1914. At Salt Lake City, Brigham Young Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. 2 to 1.

Versus Latter Day Saints University, Logan.

1914. At Logan, Brigham Young Neg. 2 to 1.

University of Utah. Salt Lake City.

Versus Brigham Young University, Utah. (See Brigham Young above.)

Versus Univ. of Denver, Colorado. (See under Colorado.)

Versus University of Oregon, Eugene.

1909. At Salt Lake City, Utah Aff. won.

1910. At Eugene, Oregon Aff. won.

1911. At Salt Lake City, Utah Neg. won.

1912. At Salt Lake City, Oregon Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus University of Colorado. (See under Colorado.)

Versus University of Montana. (See under Montana.)

Utah Agricultural College. Logan.

Versus Brigham Young University, Provo. (See Brigham Young above.)

Versus Univ. of Utah. (See Univ. of Utah above.)

Versus Montana State College, Bozeman. (See under Montana.)

Versus Univ. of Idaho, Moscow.

1915. At Logan, Idaho Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Logan. No report.

At Moscow, Idaho Aff. 1 to 0.

Versus University of Denver, Colorado.

1915. At Logan, Utah Aff. 3 to 0.

VERMONT

Middlebury College. Middlebury.

Versus St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y.

1911. At Canton, St. Lawrence Aff. won.

Versus Norwich Univ., Northfield.

1914. At Northfield, Middlebury Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus University of Vermont, Burlington.

1914. At Middlebury, Middlebury Aff. 3 to 0.

Norwich University. Northfield.

Versus Middlebury College, Vt. (See Middlebury above.)

Versus University of Vermont, Burlington.

1914. At Burlington, Univ. of Vermont Aff. 3 to 0.

University of Vermont. Burlington.

Versus Middlebury College, Vt. (See Middlebury above.)

Versus Norwich University, Vt. (See Norwich Univ. above.)

VIRGINIA

Emory and Henry College. Emory.

Versus Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.

1911. At Emory, Emory and Henry Aff. won.

1912. At Ashland, Randolph-Macon Aff. won.

1913. At Roanoke, Randolph-Macon Neg. 3 to 0.

Versus Emory College, Oxford, Ga. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C. (See under S. Carolina.)

Versus Hampden-Sidney, Va.

1915. At Emory. Winner not designated.

1916. At Hampden-Sidney, Emory and Henry Aff. 3 to 0.

Versus Virginia Military Institute, Lexington.

1916. At Emory, Emory and Henry Neg. 3 to 0.

Hampden-Sidney Institute. Hampden-Sidney.

Versus Emory and Henry College, Va. (See Emory and Henry above.)

Randolph-Macon. Ashland.

Versus Emory and Henry College, Va. (See Emory and Henry above.)

Versus Richmond College, Richmond, Va.

1911. At Richmond, Randolph-Macon Neg. won.

1912. At Ashland, Randolph-Macon won.

1913. At Richmond, Richmond Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Ashland, Randolph-Macon Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. At Richmond, Richmond Coll. Neg. 2 to 1.

1916. At Ashland, Richmond College Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.

1912. Randolph-Macon won.

1913. At Ashland, Randolph-Macon Aff. 2 to 1.

1914. At Williamsburg, Randolph-Macon Neg. 3 to 0.

1915. At Williamsburg, William and Mary Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Ashland, Randolph-Macon Aff. 3 to 0.

At Williamsburg, Randolph-Macon Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Hampden-Sidney Inst., Va.

1915. At Ashland. Decision not reported.

1916. Hampden-Sidney forfeited.

Versus Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

1914. At Salem, Roanoke Neg. 3 to 0.

Richmond College. Richmond.

Versus Randolph-Macon College, Va. (See Randolph-Macon above.)

Versus William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.

1912. At Richmond, Richmond Aff. won.

1913. At Williamsburg, Richmond Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Richmond, Richmond Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Wake Forest College, N. Carolina.

1915. At Richmond, Wake Forest Neg. 3 to 0.

At Wake Forest, Wake Forest Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Richmond, Wake Forest Neg. 3 to 0.

At Wake Forest, Wake Forest Aff. 3 to 0.

Roanoke College. Salem.

Versus Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.

1913. At Salem, Roanoke Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Randolph-Macon, Va. (See Randolph-Macon above.)

Versus William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.

1916. At Salem, Roanoke Neg. 2 to 1.

University of Virginia. Charlottesville.

Versus North Carolina Univ. (See under N. Carolina.)

Versus Vanderbilt Univ. (See under Tennessee.)

Versus Univ. of Georgia. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Tulane University. (See under Louisiana.)

Versus Johns Hopkins Univ. (See under Maryland.)

Virginia Military Institute. Lexington.

Versus Emory and Henry Coll., Va. (See Emory and Henry above.)

Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg.

Versus Roanoke College, Salem, Va. (See Roanoke Coll. above.)

Versus William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.

1914. At Blacksburg, William and Mary Aff. 3 to 0.

At Williamsburg, William and Mary Neg. 3 to 0.

Washington and Lee University. Lexington.

Versus George Washington Univ., Washington, D. C. (See under District of Columbia.)

Versus Univ. of Georgia. (See under Georgia.)

Versus Tulane University. (See under Louisiana.)

Versus Trinity College, N. C. (See under N. Carolina.)

Versus University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

1915. At Knoxville, Washington and Lee Neg. 2 to 1.

William and Mary College. Williamsburg.

Versus Randolph-Macon Univ., Va. (See Randolph-Macon above.)

Versus Richmond College, Va. (See Richmond Coll. above.)

Versus Virginia Polytechnic Inst., Va. (See Virginia Polytechnic above.)

Versus Hampden-Sidney Inst., Va.

1915. At Hampden-Sidney, Hampden-Sidney Aff. 2 to 1.

Versus Roanoke College, Salem, Va. (See Roanoke Coll. above.)

WASHINGTON

Bellingham State Normal. Bellingham.

Versus College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Wash.

1911. At Tacoma, Puget Sound Neg. won.

College of Puget Sound. Tacoma.

Versus Bellingham State Normal. (See Bellingham above.)

Versus Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon.

1915. At Tacoma, Puget Sound Aff. 2 to 1.

At Forest Grove, Pacific Univ. Aff. 2 to 1.

Gonzaga University. Spokane.

Versus University of Montana, Missoula. (See under Montana.)

Versus Univ. of Idaho, Moscow.

1913. At Spokane, Gonzaga won 3 to 0.

At Moscow, Idaho won 3 to 0.

1914. At Spokane, Gonzaga won 3 to 0.

At Moscow, Gonzaga won 3 to 0.

1915. At Spokane, Gonzaga won 2 to 1.

1915. At Moscow, Idaho won 2 to 1.

1916. At Spokane, Idaho Neg. 3 to 0.

At Moscow, Idaho 2 to 1.

Versus Montana State College. (See under Montana.)

University of Washington. Seattle.

Versus Stanford University. (See under California.)

Versus Oregon University. (See under Oregon.)

Versus Univ. of Idaho, Moscow.

1910. Washington won 2 to 1.

Versus Vancouver College, Canada.

1912. Decision not reported.

Versus Washington State College, Pullman.

1912. University won.

1913. At Pullman, Washington State Aff. 3 to 0.

1914. At Seattle, University Aff. 2 to 1.

(Women.) At Pullman, State College Aff. 3 to 0.

1915-16. No report.

Versus Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.

1912. University won.

1913. At Seattle, University Aff. 3 to 0.

(Women.) University won 3 to 0.

1914. At Seattle, Whitman Neg. 3 to 0. (Women.)

At Walla Walla, Whitman Aff. 2 to 1.

1915-16. No report.

Washington State College. Pullman.

Versus University of Washington. (See Univ. of Washington above.)

Versus Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.

1912. State College won.

At Walla Walla, Whitman won. (Women's debate.)

1913. At Walla Walla, Whitman Aff. 2 to 1.

(Women.) Decision not reported.

1914. At Pullman, State College Aff. 2 to 1.

(Women.) At Walla Walla, State College Neg. 2 to 1.

1915-16. No report.

Versus Univ. of Montana. (See under Montana.)

Versus Univ. of Idaho, Moscow.

1916. At Pullman, Washington State won.

At Moscow, Washington State won.

Whitman College. Walla Walla.

Versus University of Washington, Seattle. (See Univ. of Wash.)

Versus Washington State College. (See Washington State Coll. above.)

Versus University of Idaho, Moscow.

1911. At Moscow, Idaho Aff. won.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College. Bethany.

Versus Westminster College, Pa. (See under Pennsylvania.)

Versus West Virginia Wesleyan, Buckhannon.

1914. At Buckhannon, Bethany Aff. 2 to 1.

1915. No report.

Versus Marietta College, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

West Virginia Wesleyan. Buckhannon.

Versus Bethany College, W. Va. (See Bethany Coll. above.)

Versus Marietta College, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

Versus Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio.

1911. West Va. Wesleyan Aff. won.

Versus Mt. Union College, Alliance, Ohio.

1911. Mt. Union Aff. won.

Versus Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.

1913. At Buckhannon, W. Va. Wesleyan Aff. 3 to 0.

WISCONSIN

Beloit College. Beloit.

Versus Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. (See under Illinois.)

Versus Albion College, Mich. (See under Michigan.)

Versus Grinnell College, Iowa.

1911. At Beloit, Beloit Neg. won.

Versus Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

1913. At Beloit, Lawrence Neg. 3 to 0.

1914. At Appleton, Lawrence Aff. 3 to 0.

1915. No report.

1916. At Beloit, Beloit Neg. 2 to 1.
Versus Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.
1913. At Ripon, Beloit Neg. 2 to 1.
1914. At Beloit, Beloit Aff. 3 to 0.
1915. At Ripon, Ripon Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.
1916. At Waukesha, Beloit Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Cornell College, Iowa. (See under Iowa.)
- Carroll College.** Waukesha.
Versus Northwestern College, Naperville, Ill. (See under Illinois.)
Versus Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.
1910. Carroll won.
1911. Lawrence won on Neg.
1912. At Waukesha, Carroll won.
1914. At Appleton, Lawrence Aff. 2 to 1.
1916. At Appleton, Carroll Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill. (See under Illinois.)
Versus Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.
1913. At Waukesha, Carroll Aff. 2 to 1.
1916. At Ripon, Ripon Aff. 3 to 0.
Versus Milton College, Milton, Wis.
1913. At Milton, Milton Aff. 2 to 1.
1914. At Waukesha, Carroll Neg. 3 to 0.
- Lawrence College.** Appleton.
Versus St. Olaf College, Minn. (See under Minn.)
Versus Hamline Univ., Minn. (See under Minn.)
Versus Albion College, Mich. (See under Mich.)
Versus Carroll College, Wis. (See Carroll Coll. above.)
Versus Beloit College, Wis. (See Beloit Coll. above.)
Versus Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.
1913. At Appleton, Lawrence Aff. 3 to 0.
1914. At Ripon, Lawrence Neg. 3 to 0.
1915. At Appleton, Lawrence Aff. 2 to 1.
Versus Cornell College, Iowa. (See under Iowa.)
Versus Gustavus Adolphus Coll., Minn. (See under Minn.)
Versus Macalester College, Minn. (See under Minn.)

Milton College. Milton.

Versus Carroll College, Wis. (See Carroll Coll. above.)

Versus Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.

1913. At Milton, Milton Neg. 2 to 1.

1914. At Ripon, Milton Neg. 2 to 1.

Oshkosh State Normal. Oshkosh.

Versus Illinois State Normal. (See under Illinois.)

Versus Indiana State Normal. (See under Indiana.)

Versus Stevens Point Normal, Wis.

1913. At Oshkosh, Stevens Point Neg. 2 to 1.

1915. At Oshkosh, Stevens Point Aff. 3 to 0.

1916. At Stevens Point, Stevens Point Neg. 3 to 0.

Ripon College. Ripon.

Versus Carleton College, Minn. (See under Minn.)

Versus Coe College, Iowa. (See under Iowa.)

Versus Lawrence College, Wis. (See Lawrence College above.)

Versus Carroll College, Wis. (See Carroll College above.)

Versus Beloit College, Wis. (See Beloit Coll. above.)

Versus Milton College, Wis. (See Milton College above.)

Versus Northwestern College, Illinois (Naperville). (See under Illinois.)

River Falls Normal. River Falls.

Versus Stevens Point Normal, Wis. (See Stevens Point.)

Stevens Point Normal. Stevens Point.

Versus Oshkosh Normal, Wis. (See Oshkosh Normal above.)

Versus River Falls Normal, River Falls, Wis.

1915. At Stevens Point, River Falls Aff. 2 to 1.

1916. At River Falls, Stevens Point Neg. 2 to 1.

Versus Superior Normal, Superior, Wis.

1916. At Stevens Point, Stevens Point Aff. 2 to 1.

Superior Normal. Superior.

Versus Stevens Point Normal, Wis. (See Stevens Point above.)

Versus River Falls Normal, Wis.

1916. At Superior. No report.

University of Wisconsin. Madison.

Versus Univ. of Illinois. (See under Illinois.)

Versus Univ. of Iowa. (See under Iowa.)

Versus Univ. of Nebraska. (See under Nebraska.)

Versus University of Minnesota. (See under Minnesota.)

Versus Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. (See under Iowa.)

Versus University of Michigan. (See under Michigan.)

WYOMING

University of Wyoming. Laramie.

Versus University of Denver, Colo. (See under Colorado.)

Versus Colorado Agri. Coll. (See under Colorado.)

THE END

INDEX TO THIS VOLUME

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATES, VOL. VII

	PAGE
CITY MANAGER PLAN OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT	III
Affirmative	113, 120, 127, 159, 167, 174
Negative	134, 142, 148, 182, 190, 197
Bibliography	204
Accomplishment of plan (See also Experience)	131
Administrative methods	150, 176, 199-200
Aldermanic plan	114, 162
Experience of	193
Analogous to corporation organization.....	121, 122, 160, 175
Analogous to our school system	122, 160
Change necessary or unnecessary	115, 141, 148, 152, 193, 197
Cities voting against it	196, 198
Civic duty and form of government	137, 202
Concentration of power	115, 118, 121, 186-87
Control of manager by council a weakness	140
Danger of one man power	126, 171, 185-188
Definition of Municipality	134, 159
Dilemma in Commission Government	119, 124, 165
Efficiency of	143, 149, 169-70, 173, 175
Election versus appointment	138-39, 143, 169, 183
Experience with city manager plan	140, 150-52, 173-4, 177-78, 190-91
Shows failure	195
Faults of Aldermanic form	116
Features of city manager plan	114, 160, 166
Friction between manager and council	139-40, 186, 195
Graft and politics	144-146, 186, 200
Historical sketch of municipal government	113-114
Issues—Affirmative 115. Negative	135-36
Managing is a profession	130
Municipality and state	201
Municipal problems	199
Party politics	162, 163
Personnel of council improved	167
Practicability in a metropolis	141, 188, 191
Practicability in a small village	192

	PAGE
Questionnaire on city manager plan	180
Remedies evils of present system	128
Responsibility fixed	115, 117, 163, 172
Responsive to will of people	126
Single executive	118-123, 165, 171
Unsound in principle	138, 182
Weakness of commission government	118-120, 164, 194
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS	387
Affirmative	389, 403, 411
Negative	416, 425, 434, 437
Bibliography	444
Competition	400, 408
Complication of present system	421
Concentration of capital in railroads	394
Construction under private ownership	393-4
Cost of government ownership of railroads	406
Definition of interstate	411-12, 417, 429, 434-5, 438
Discrimination	431
Division of railroad system	418, 420, 422
Does not give government complete control	426
Efficiency of service	409
Expedient	390-91
Federal charter	441
Financial situation of the railroads	390, 392, 395, 407
Government ownership is economic saving	397, 408
Government would be hampered in operation	430
Impracticable	426
Improvement on railroad and in service	404, 408
In other countries	390-91
Interstate commerce commission	400
Intra-state railroads	426-437, 439
Land monopoly of railroads	398
Manipulation	397
Political danger	402
Private ownership has failed	391
Profit	396-7
Private ownership offers no hope for future	395
Rates	393, 396, 398-99, 414
Reason for taking interstate roads	403-4, 412
Regulation	395, 400, 405, 421-2, 432, 441
Seriously considered	413
Sound in theory	400
Terminals of interstate roads	429
Texas situation	428
Unity of railroad system	399, 408, 410, 414, 419, 435
INCREASED ARMY AND NAVY	339

	PAGE
Affirmative	341, 348, 355, 362, 365, 368
Negative	371, 378
Aeroplane service	359
America a world power	351
American isolation	342
American military weakness	346, 378, 379
Are army and navy now adequate?	356, 363
Army conditions	357, 378, 379
Can not give up military defense	356
Capturing Villa	348
Coast defense	346, 357-58, 366
Control of the Pacific	346, 353
Convergence of national interests	354
Cost of present war	375
Danger of war	342, 349, 368, 372, 375
Defences of Panama Canal	376
Efficiency of army	380-87
Failure in civilization to protect against war	343-44
Impending invasion	355, 369, 372
Japanese danger	346, 373
Militarism	345
Militia	359
Monroe Doctrine	375
National friendships	344
Naval need	360, 363, 371
Need of preparedness	345
Neutrality requires preparedness	354
Our commerce demands increase and security	351
Peace agreement after war	377
Plans for army of United States	347
Post-bellum prophecy	352-53
Sea not a protection	343
Standing army	346-47, 357
LABOR UNION EXEMPTION FROM SHERMAN LAW	45
Affirmative	47, 57, 57, 71
Negative	77, 88, 100
Bibliography	106
Application of Sherman Law	62
Buck Stove and Range Co. case	61, 80
Capital and labor economic sources of production	84
Cincinnati Ice workers strike	97
Class legislation	51, 67, 85
Clayton amendment	45, 58, 67
—a political measure	79
Danbury Hatters case	64, 92, 95
Discrimination against labor	61-62

	PAGE
Injunctions in labor disputes	58, 60
Injury to public	64, 74
Injustice to labor	60
Injustice to organized labor	83
Labor's competition with capital	63
Labor as a commodity	54, 56, 79
Labor influence on production and distribution of commodity	69
Labor will take advantage of exemption .64, 66, 82, 92-93, 99	
Laws governing capital and labor should be different	52-56, 68, 87
Necessity of labor unions	48, 71
Operation of exemption in England	70, 100
Principle of exemption	51, 86
Rights of labor	53, 80, 105
Sherman law and labor organization	81, 84, 104
Should labor unions be classed with trusts? 50, 60, 69, 84-85	
Sympathetic strike	59, 73, 81, 95
Union a party to combination is restraint of trade	55-56, 89-91, 92
What labor gets in the exemption	78
OPEN DOOR POLICY IN THE ORIENT	209
Affirmative	211, 216, 221, 227, 230, 233
Negative	236, 242, 248, 254, 257, 261
Bibliography	265
Attitude of England	213
Attitude of nations of Europe	253
Attitude toward China	219
China does not need our interference	246-47
China does not want our interference	245
Chinese exclusion	259-60
Control of the Pacific	225
Historical sketch	211-12
Insistence to the point of war	232
Insistence would increase our burden	243
Involves change in our policy	247
Japan and Korea	223, 234, 263
Japan's attitude toward the United States	224
Japan's attitude toward China	215, 220, 221, 233, 256
Japanizing of China	257-58
Japanese demands	222-23, 229, 263
Japan does not need to violate Hay agreement ...	240-41, 261
Japanese Monroe doctrine	249
Less danger of war to insist on Open Door now	226
Meaning of Open Door policy 212-13, 227, 238-39, 254-55, 264	
Our commerce does not justify interference	228, 241, 251

	PAGE
Our influence in China not commercial	244-45
Our past action in maintaining the Open Door ...	217-218, 231
Our policy altruistic	261-17 219, 228
Our treaty obligations to China	217-18, 231, 243, 258
Pacific Policy of the United States	250
Philippines and our geographical connection	220
Situation in the Orient	215, 218
Terms of Hay agreement	212, 237
United States has moral principle to uphold	214
Unsound Military policy for U. S. to interfere in Orient..	250, 252
SOCIALISTIC CONTROL OF PRODUCTION AND EXCHANGE	269
Affirmative	271, 279, 287, 298
Negative	304, 311, 318, 327
Bibliography	331
Appropriations	323-24
The Banks	286
Child labor	274
Civil service	314-15
Concentration of wealth	273-4
Consumer and socialism	284-85
Corporation is impersonal	276
Definition	272
Democracy not efficient in business methods	320-21
Dissolution of trusts	299
Economic injustice	274
Evils of Socialism	320
Evils of capitalistic system	273
Example of Germany	293-94
Government lacks responsiveness to need of moment	321
Incentive to courtesy and service under Socialism	316
Increased cost of living	275, 279-280
Ideal of each system good	304, 306
Individual Initiative	312-13
Individual merit and socialism	315
Inheritance tax	309
Log-rolling for local graft, etc.	322-23
Municipal ownership succeeds	291-92
Opprobrium of "Socialistic"	271-272
Panama Canal socialistic	292
Paternalism	317
Policy of laissez-faire	288-89, 312
Practicability of	290, 300, 328
Present conditions	273, 275, 279-280, 288, 327
Profit in capitalistic system	276-77
Purchasing power of dollar	275

	PAGE
Reforms	280-81, 288, 307-08
attitude of capital toward reforms	281
Regulation	298
Tendency toward combination	296
United States steel corporation	283
Wages and socialism	280, 284
Women in industry	274
Would throw men out of work	329-30
SWISS MILITARY SYSTEM	I
Affirmative	3, 9, 14
Negative	18, 23, 29
Bibliography	36
Adequacy of Swiss system	10, 21, 30, 32
Citizen reserve army	3, 10, 24
Comparison of United States and Switzerland	20, 32
Compulsory military service and democracy ...	5-6, 8, 10, 22
Compulsory military training in schools	32-33
Conscription	22
Cost of military service	13
Cost of Swiss system to the United States	27
Economics of compulsory military service	25
Effect on world peace	27
Immigration and military service	5
Militarism	12, 25-26
Military need of the United States. (See Need) ...	20, 21
Military service and capital and labor	6
Militia	15, 16
Necessity of large army	11, 17
Need of regular army	21, 31
Number of men of military age in the United States ...	24
Our isolation	28, 29
Our policy	3, 14
Physical benefit of military service	7
Preparedness	11, 19, 34
Swiss plan	3-4, 19
Term of service necessary	31
Volunteer system	7-8, 13-14

GENERAL INDEX

TO THE FIRST SEVEN VOLUMES OF INTER-COLLEGIATE DEBATES.

	PAGE
ABANDONMENT OF MONROE DOCTRINE (see under Monroe Doctrine, Vol. V).	
ACCIDENT INSURANCE (see Insurance).	
ALASKAN CONSERVATION	Vol. II. 261
ALDRICH MONETARY PLAN	Vol. III. 359, 362, 370
ANNEXATION OF CUBA	Vol. I. 391
Affirmative	391, 393, 395
Negative	396, 398, 399
Bibliography	401
Annexation of Cuba	
America responsible for Cuba	392, 396
Cuban independence	392, 396-7, 400
Cuba's prosperity	398
Cuban rebellion	397
Economic basis for	391-2
Necessary to the world's business interests	394, 396
Not desired by America	398
Not a military necessity	399
Protectorate a failure	392, 395
APPOINTMENT VS. ELECTION OF JUDGES	Vol. I. 345
Affirmative	345, 347
Negative	350, 356
Bibliography	363
Appointment vs. election of judges	
Appointment by executive or legislature subordinates	
judiciary	353
Appointment fixes responsibility	346
Courts, the highest power over legislation	352
Dangers of appointment	354
Election educational	355
Election dangerous	347-8, 360
Election is democratic	351-2
Executive will choose better men than electors	346
Historical sketch of appointment plan	350

	PAGE
Independence of judges	348
Length of term	348, 356, 362
Non-Partisan nominations	357
Politics and judges	359
Present state systems of choosing judges	351
APPRENTICES IN LABOR UNIONS	Vol. III, 212
ARMED INTERVENTION FOR THE COLLECTION OF DEBTS ..	Vol. I, 223
Affirmative	223, 226, 229, 231
Negative	233, 235, 236, 238
Bibliography	239
Armed Intervention	
and Monroe Doctrine	229
and world peace	226, 228, 230
Arbitration	226-7, 230, 234
Bad policy	223
Beneficial policy	237
Case of 1903	226
Causes delay in payment	224, 228
Definition	223, 233-4
Encourages conquest and aggression	229
Is illegal	225
Strong vs. weak	224
The Hague Conference law	226, 235
Unjust claims	224-5
Unjust use of power	224
Venezuela	230, 232, 234, 235
ASSET CURRENCY (see Central Bank)	Vol. I, 191
Affirmative	191, 192, 194
Negative	194, 196
Bibliography	197
Asset Currency	
Bank reserves	196
Currency redemption	194
Elasticity of	192
Need of	192-3, 195
Safety of	193, 195
Suffolk system	192
BANKING (see Asset Currency, Central Bank, Guarantee of Deposits, Bank Notes).	
BANK NOTES SECURED BY COMMERCIAL PAPER	Vol. I, 34
Affirmative	I, 8, 13, 32
Negative	17, 22, 27, 32
Bibliography	34
Bank Notes	
Asset currency	2, 28

	PAGE
Bank failures	II, 20
Bonds, bond system	I, 4, 5, 13, 23, 24, 25
Canadian system	4, 6, II, 14
Credit currency	20
Plan for	9, 14, 18
Currency stability	8, 9, 28
Discount rate	12
Elasticity	3, 5, 7, 23
English system	22, 23
National bank notes	I, 13
Panic, cause of	18, 21, 33
Panic of 1907	4
Speculation	19
Suffolk system	15, 16, 19
BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES	Vol. I. xi
34, 55, 89, 107, 123, 137, 143, 159, 186, 197, 219, 239, 258, 290,	
297, 321, 341, 363, 372, 386, 401, 431, 437, 476, 495. Vol. II. 52,	
121, 181, 229, 279, 313. Vol. III. 38, 76, 183, 226, 308, 337,	
384. Vol. IV. 49, 141, 187, 245, 296, 373, 411, 515. Vol. V. 50,	
147, 216, 275, 323, 392, 435. Vol. VI. 67, 153, 197, 242, 312, 374.	
BRIBERY AND GRAFT. Vol. I. 475. Vol. II. 289, 298, 349, 355-6	
Vol. III. 4-5, 14, 24, 30, 355-6.	
CABINET OFFICERS IN CONGRESS	Vol. IV. i
Affirmative	3, II, 19
Negative	27, 34, 42
Bibliography	49
and committee system in congress	15, 20, 29, 33, 36, 39-40
—Bryce on committee system	30, 36, 37, 38
—Hinsdale on committee system	33
and English parliamentary system	42, 46, 48
and the national budget	25
and political complexion of congress	45, 46
and presidential policies	18, 19
and special messages	31
and the veto	25
Checks and balances under	5, 8
Communication between departments	7, 8, 9, 12, 40
—Gov. Cox, of Ohio, on communication of departments	41
—Justice Story on	12
Coöperation of congress and executive	
5, 6, 7, 20, 31, 33, 37,	41
—Pres. Wilson on coöperation of departments—	10, 19, 26
—Burke on coöperation in government	18
—Bagehot on	28
—Chancellor Kent on	39

	PAGE
Danger of	38, 45, 46, 47
Efficiency of	20-23, 35, 41, 48
Examples showing the necessity of	20, 21, 22
Executive aid in legislation	4-5, 35-36
—Pres. A. L. Lowell on executive in legislation	44
Historical sketch of	3
Judiciary as a check	6
Locating responsibility under	16, 17, 18, 48
Montesquieu's theory	6
Pendleton bills for	I, 2, 12
Publicity in government	11, 13-14, 15, 31-32
Position of cabinet officers	28-29, 46-47
Relation of departments, Madison on	5, 6
—Montesquieu's theory	6
Separation of departments	3, 8, 28
—Burke on	45
—Hinsdale on	28
—President Butler, of Columbia University, on	23
Territorial representation in congress	9
Would unify legislation	24
CANADA	
Vol. I. 4, 6, 11, 14, 450. Vol. III. 344, 368, 369, 372, 381	
CARD INDEX	Vol. I. xi-xii. Vol. II. xiv
CHILD LABOR	Vol. I. 440
CONSTITUTIONALITY	Vol. I. 46
CENTRAL BANK	Vol. I. 325. Vol. III. 341
Affirmative	
Vol. I. 325, 328, 330. Vol. III. 341, 350, 359, 362	
Negative	Vol. I. 333, 336, 339. Vol. III. 367, 373, 379
Bibliography	Vol. I. 34. Vol. III. 384
Central Bank	
Aldrich plan	Vol. III. 359, 362, 370
and congress	Vol. I. 334
and fiscal system of United States...	Vol. III. 350, 352-3, 356
and gold standard	Vol. I. 330, 331
and good business method	Vol. III. 343, 351, 354
Asset currency	Vol. I. 2, 28, 191, 332. Vol. III. 356
—need of	Vol. I. 192-3, 195
—safety of	Vol. I. 193, 195
Bank failures	Vol. I. 11, 20
Bank growth and public confidence	Vol. III. 374-5
Bank reserves	Vol. III. 345, 368, 382
Bond Currency (see National bank notes)	Vol. I. 331
Bonds, and bond system (see National bank system)....	
Vol. I. 1, 4, 5, 13, 23, 24, 25, 32	
Canadian system	
Vol. I. 4, 6, 11, 14. Vol. III. 344, 368, 369, 372, 381	

	PAGE
Credit Currency (see Asset Currency)	
—plan for	Vol. I. 20. Vol. III. 342, 358
Currency redemption	Vol. I. 194
Currency stability	Vol. I. 8, 9, 28
Currency system, the present	Vol. III. 342-3, 374
Dangerous tyranny	Vol. III. 371, 372, 378
Definition	Vol. III. 359-60-61
Discount rate	Vol. I. 12. Vol. III. 349
Distribution of public funds	Vol. III. 355
Elasticity	
Vol. I. 3, 5, 7, 23, 192, 327. Vol. III. 344, 368, 369, 380, 381	
Emergency currency, Treat plan	Vol. III. 381
English Bank. Vol. I. 22, 23, 332, 339, 340. Vol. III. 369, 372	
French Bank	Vol. III. 356, 372
German Bank	Vol. I. 332, 339, 340. Vol. III. 356, 372
Government control of	Vol. I. 336, 338, 339
Government extravagance	Vol. III. 343
Government indebtedness	Vol. III. 342, 343
Historical sketch, national banks	Vol. I. 325
In politics	Vol. III. 357, 376
Lack of confidence in present system	Vol. I. 326-7
Lack of control in present system	Vol. I. 326-7
Lack of coöperation in present system	Vol. I. 326-7
Monopoly control	Vol. III. 358, 361, 377
National bank notes	Vol. I. 1, 13. Vol. III. 342, 344
National bank system	Vol. III. 354, 375
New York	Vol. III. 377
Panics	Vol. I. 4, 18, 21, 33, 309, 319. Vol. III. 349, 367
Panic of 1907	Vol. I. 4. Vol. III. 353
People do not want a central bank	Vol. III. 370
Plan for	Vol. I. 328. Vol. III. 347, 373, 376
Pork barrel method of distributing government funds...	
Vol. III. 355-56	
Seasonal demand for money	Vol. III. 343, 348
Second U. S. national bank	Vol. III. 357, 371, 380
Sectional objection	Vol. III. 371, 372, 377
Speculation	Vol. I. 19
Suffolk system	Vol. I. 15, 16, 19, 22, 193, 341
U. S. Treasury system	
Vol. I. 326, 330. Vol. III. 350, 353, 383	
Webster and the treasury system	Vol. III. 352
Will get into politics	Vol. I. 335
Would create money monopoly	Vol. I. 336
Would not work in the United States	Vol. I. 337

	PAGE
CENTRALIZATION OF POWER IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.....	Vol. II. 250, 267, 278
CHICAGO	Vol. III. 5, 8, 18, 324, 325, 354
CITY MANAGER PLAN OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT... Vol. VII.	111
Affirmative	113, 120, 127, 159, 167, 174
Negative	134, 142, 148, 182, 190, 197
Bibliography	204
Accomplishment of plan (See also Experience)	131
Administrative methods	150, 176, 199-200
Aldermanic plan	114, 162
—Experience of	193
Analogous to corporation organization	121, 122, 160, 175
Analogous to our school system	122, 160
Change necessary or unnecessary ..	115, 141, 148, 152, 193, 197
Cities voting against it	196, 198
Civic duty and form of government	137, 202
Concentration of power	115, 118, 121, 186-87
Control of manager by council a weakness	140
Danger of one man power	126, 171, 185-188
Definition of Municipality	134, 159
Dilemma in Commission Government	119, 124, 165
Efficiency of	143, 149, 169-70, 173, 175
Election versus appointment	138-39, 143, 169, 183
Experience with city manager plan	140, 150-52, 173-4, 177-78, 190-91
—Shows failure	195
Faults of Aldermanic form	116
Features of city manager plan	114, 160, 166
Friction between manager and council	139-40, 186, 195
Graft and politics	144-146, 186, 200
Historical sketch of municipal government	113-114
Issues—Affirmative 115. Negative	135-36
Managing is a profession	130
Municipality and state	201
Municipal problems	199
Party politics	162-163
Personnel of council improved	167
Practicability in a metropolis	141, 188, 191
Practicability in a small village	192
Questionnaire on city manager plan	180
Remedies evils of present system	128
Responsibility fixed	115, 117, 163, 172
Responsive to will of people	126
Single executive	118-123, 165, 171
Unsound in principle	138, 182
Weakness of commission government	118-120, 164, 194

	PAGE
CLOSED SHOP (see Labor).	
COLORADO TRIPLE PROJECT	Vol. II. 257
COMMISSION GOVERNMENT Vol. I. 461. Vol. II. 335. Vol. III. 1	
Affirmative	Vol. I. 461. Vol. III. 1, 7, 13
Negative	Vol. I. 465, 471. Vol. III. 19, 25, 31
Bibliography	Vol. I. 476. Vol. III. 38
Commission Government	
Analogy with federal government	Vol. III. 2, 4
and checks and balances	Vol. I. 473. Vol. III. 23
and civic duty	Vol. III. 21
and Initiative and Referendum	Vol. I. 474
and recall	Vol. III. 12
and social conditions	Vol. III. 31
and ward system	Vol. III. 8, 9
Business government under	Vol. III. 4, 5, 6, 11, 14, 22
Centralization of power under	Vol. III. 22
City a corporation (see Business Government)...	Vol. I. 464
Definition of	Vol. III. 1
Democracy of	Vol. I. 467, 472. Vol. III. 16
Efficiency of, in administration	Vol. III. 9, 25, 29
—in legislation	Vol. III. 28
Evils of present system	Vol. I. 463
Experience in Cedar Rapids	Vol. III. 14, 16
of Des Moines	Vol. I. 468. Vol. III. 10, 14
of Galveston	Vol. I. 461. Vol. III. 10
of Haverhill, Mass.	Vol. III. 14
of Houston, Tex.	Vol. I. 462. Vol. III. 14
Experience of Chicago under present system	Vol. III. 5, 8, 18
Fusion and separation of functions of government.....	Vol. III. 28, 30, 32, 36
Gets efficient men for office	Vol. I. 464
Graft	Vol. I. 475. Vol. III. 4-5, 14, 24, 30
Historical sketch of	Vol. I. 466
Indiana plan of municipal government	Vol. III. 33
Party politics under	Vol. III. 7, 26, 27
Public utilities under	Vol. III. 15
Responsibility under	Vol. I. 475. Vol. III. 4, 11
versus Mayor and council system	Vol. I. 467
COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE	Vol. VI. 317
Affirmative	319, 332, 343, 346
Negative	350, 358, 363, 371
Bibliography	374
Adequacy of	335, 358
Arbitration	320
Benefit to the men trained	338

	PAGE
Breeds distrust	352
Commercial war	339
Comparison of systems	366
Condition of navy	330, 363, 367, 372
Cost of.....	336-7, 348, 354, 370-71
Danger of war	322
Defense of Panama Canal	327
Definition	321
Economic superiority of	345
Effectiveness of	360
European strength after the war	331
Foreign population	326
Friendship of nations	353
Gospel of hatred	351-52
Hawaii a danger	323
Historical sketch	321
Industrial education while under arms	340, 370
Initiation of the question	319
Inquisitorial features	354
Is just	345
Isolation of the United States	324
Japan menaces us	322-24
Militia	329
Monroe Doctrine	322
Number of men affected by	333
Number of men needed for defense	328-329
One year plan	348, 359, 369
Philippine Islands	323
Preparedness	325, 336, 351
Present army, size of	328-329
Present force sufficient	327
Principle of compulsion	346
Race supremacy	326
Reserve system	334-35, 363, 370-71
Result of volunteer system	331
Strength of treaties	320
Un-American	350
Volunteer system	331, 343, 351, 361, 371
War spirit	354
War staff plan	364, 369-70
World peace and	347, 352, 367
CONSERVATION	Vol. I. 443. Vol. II. 159, 186, 227, 235
Affirmative	Vol. II. 235
Negative	Vol. II. 253
Bibliography	279

Conservation Vol. II.	PAGE
Alaskan	261
and emigration and immigration	266
by federal government	236, 238, 242, 244, 248, 250, 256
by states	237, 254, 258, 263, 267, 277, 285
Colorado Triple Project	257
Definition	235
Franchise tax	264
National resources belong to all the people	236
Reclamation projects	243
Table of products	255
Water power	245
CORPORATIONS, FEDERAL CHARTER FOR (see also under Inter- state Commerce)	Vol. IV. 191
Affirmative	191, 198, 205, 207, 210
Negative	213, 221, 228, 235, 238, 242
Artificiality of interstate commerce division	218
Centralization of industry	226
Comity and courtesy	195, 227
Compulsory federal incorporation	219
Definition of terms in question	191-2, 205, 214
Dual system of government under	208, 216, 218, 234, 236-7, 243-44
Evasion of	209, 211, 223, 227, 239, 244
Evils of corporations	192, 201, 223-25
Evils of state system	193-200, 203, 213
Foreign corporations	194-5
History of corporations	192, 199
Inadequate	222
Interholding of corporations	194, 201
Is all inclusive	205-6, 214, 235-36, 240, 243
Issue of debate	242
Legal decisions	198, 199, 223, 229, 251
Litigation under	206, 212
Manufacturing and commerce	224
Merits of federal incorporation	203-4
Merits of substitute plan	233-34
Negative point of view	213-14
Not necessary	230, 240
Overcapitalization	193, 201
Police power of states	206, 209-10
Prerogative of federal government	198, 206-7
Protection of the investor	204, 234
Provisions of federal incorporation act	202
Publicity	194, 201, 204, 233
Stock exchange, regulation of, a remedy	232
Substitute plan	230-31

	PAGE
—closing mails as substitute	233
Taxation of corporations	196, 204, 207, 210
Uniformity of law	195, 203, 234
CUBA (see Annexation).	

DEBATING..Vol. I. Introduction. Vol. II. Introduction and	
Appendixes. Vol. IV. Introduction and Appendixes.	
Bibliography of	Vol. II. 483. Vol. IV. 515
Audience, debating for the	Vol. I. xvii, xviii, xix
Briefs	Vol. I. vii
—careless methods in	Vol. I. viii
Card indexes	Vol. I. xi, xii. Vol. II. xiv
Choosing the team	Vol. II. xviii
Committed speeches	Vol. I. xiii. Vol. II. x
Contracts, constitutions and agreements	Vol. IV. 487
Conventional debate	Vol. IV. xvi
Decisions, prejudiced	Vol. I. xxiii, xxiv. Vol. II. xix
Delivery	Vol. I. xxii. Vol. II. xiii
Dual debate	Vol. IV. xxix-xxx, 423, 497, 499
Effectiveness	Vol. I. xvii, xviii
Extempore debate	Vol. IV. xii-xiii
Extempore speaking	Vol. II. xiii
Honesty in	Vol. II. xvii
Honor societies	Vol. II. xxiii
Improvement in debate	Vol. IV. xi-xii
Increase in number of debates	Vol. IV. viii
Innovations in	Vol. IV. xxv
Judges....Vol. I. xxiii. Vol. II. xix. Vol. IV. xxvii-xxviii	
Keeping records of	Vol. I. xxvi. Vol. II. xi
Leagues	Vol. I. xxvi. Vol. II. xxi, 751
Limitations upon student debaters and enterprises.....	
	Vol. IV. ix-x
Methods in	Vol. I. xii, xiii. Vol. II. ix
Minor strategies	Vol. IV. xxiii
One-point debate	Vol. IV. xxi
Organizations	
Vol. I. xxvi. Vol. II. 413. Vol. III. 389. Vol. IV. 417	
Point of view	Vol. II. xvi
Progress of	Vol. IV. vii
Questions—Vol. I. viii, 499. Vol. II. xx. Vol. II. 413, 431	
—choice of	Vol. I. ix, x
—uneven	Vol. I. xxiii, xxiv
Rebuttal	Vol. I. xx. Vol. II. x
Record of	Vol. IV. 425

	PAGE
References for debaters	Vol. IV. 515
References for debates	Vol. IV. 49, 141, 187, 245, 296, 373, 411
Some faults in	Vol. I. xiv, xv. Vol. II. x, xi, xii, xiii
Squad system	Vol. IV. xi
Status of	Vol. I. xxi
Strategy of	Vol. IV. xiv
Subjects	Vol. IV. xxx, xxxi
Suggested changes in procedure. Vol. I. xxi, xxii. Vol. II. viii	
Surprise debate	Vol. IV. xvi-xvii
Systems of debate	Vol. IV. xv
Table of results	Vol. IV. 485-86
Tendencies of	Vol. IV. xxviii
Triangulars	Vol. I. xxvii. Vol. II. 413
Year Book of 1912-13	Vol. IV. 415
DIRECT PRIMARIES	Vol. III. 43
Affirmative	Vol. III. 43, 52, 61, 71
Negative	Vol. III. 70
Bibliography	76
Direct Primaries	
and conventions	46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 57, 71
and corruption	48
and delegate system	45
and judiciary	75
and the machine	53
and strength of party	54
and the vote	65
Bossism	47, 53, 58, 67
Crawford, Senator, on	62
Defects of	54, 63, 72, 73
Definition of	44
Education in government	64, 66
Gets the best candidates	59, 60
Gives control to the people	55, 57, 59, 69
Gore, Senator, on	62
Hughes, Justice, on	58
In the city	68, 73
Merriam, C. E., on	57, 69
Nomination system better	56, 57, 58, 72
Party caucus	48
People demand it	61
Primary laws in force (States)	42, 64, 74
Roosevelt on	62
Van Sant on (Ex. Gov. Minn.)	59

ENGLAND Vol. I. 22, 23, 115, 116, 332, 339, 340, 421. Vol. II. 77, 98, 100, 112, 116. Vol. III. 128, 148, 158, 169, 172.

	PAGE
EXPRESS BUSINESS, FEDERAL CONTROL OF	Vol. V. 57
Affirmative	57, 64, 68, 74, 77, 80, 91, 100, 109, 113, 116
Negative	123, 129, 135, 139, 142, 144
Bibliography	147
Accounting expense	60, 66, 88, 131
An American institution	57
Brokerage division	143
Cheaper service in	64-66, 133
Civil service in (with federal control)	72, 105
Competition in	60, 68, 89, 97, 114, 121, 129, 142
Cost of ownership to government	68, 108, 144
Economics of	58-59, 60, 98
Efficiency of	61, 75, 78, 82-3, 100, 127
Experience in government parcel carrying	
—Austria-Hungary	103
—Belgium	102
—Germany	101
—Russia	102
—Switzerland	102
Faults of	112, 123
Government ownership of	57-8, 79, 80, 85-6, 111, 141
—Demand for	113, 114
—Economic	86
—Efficiency of	64, 65, 66, 120, 125
—Politics in	71-72
—Practicability of	71, 77, 108, 113
—Success of	101-104
Government regulation of	
62, 63, 76, 78, 92-3, 97, 110, 114, 123, 141	
Hepburn act and	63
Lobbying of	95
Mercantile division	94
Monopoly	91, 98
Nature of	58
Parcel post	67, 75, 81, 83, 87, 89, 107
—weight limit of	84-5, 117, 124, 139
Postal system	74, 82, 119
Private ownership of	127
Railroad contracts	66, 69, 145
—Parcel post unfair to railroads	120, 132
Rates	75, 76, 92, 97, 139
—Unjust	59, 60, 61, 109
Rural service	62, 89, 99, 114
Service of (large and small package)	115, 133, 136, 145
—Extent of	62, 64, 65
—Under Postal system	126, 130, 133, 136, 140-141

	PAGE
Taxation of	96
United States Express Co.	76, 100, 123
Wages to employees	69
Watered stock	92
FEDERAL CHARTER (see Corporations and Interstate Commerce).	
FRANCE	Vol. I. 423. Vol. III. 356, 372
FREE TRADE	Vol. II. 168, 178
GERMANY	Vol. I. 332, 339, 340. Vol. III. 356, 372
GOVERNMENT (see Cabinet Officers in Congress)	
Vol. I. 435. Vol. III. 241	
Education in. Vol. I. 76. Vol. II. 340, 359. Vol. III. 64, 66	
Government Ownership of Coal Mines	Vol. I. 435
Affirmative	435, 438, 441, 444, 446
Negative	448, 449, 451, 453
Bibliography	457
Abuses of coal trust	440-1
and conservation	443
and control by commission (Canadian plan)	450-2
and individual initiative	451
and leasing system	442, 456
and national debt	444
Cost of buying mines	444, 448
Price of coal	440, 452
Railroad and coal mine owner	455
Regulation, state	438
—federal	439, 447
Socialistic	446
Trust proposition	435, 436
—Northern Securities case	437
—Sherman anti-trust law	437
Waste in mining	439, 449
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS. Vol. VI. 383	
Affirmative	383, 389, 396, 403, 406, 410
Negative	415, 421, 427, 435, 437, 441
Abuses in present system	384
Affirmative plan for	393, 406, 438-39
Bond issue	392
Bureau of railroad economics	437
Canadian experience	426
Capitalization	388, 415, 435
Civil service	392, 393, 422-23
Comparison with Germany	390, 416, 418-19
Competition	401-02, 431, 432

	PAGE
Consolidation and monopoly	402-03, 412, 431
Democracy and government ownership	417
Discrimination	420-21, 429, 444
Efficient labor	407
Efficiency of service	400, 412, 417
Experience of our government with railroads	409
Experience of other governments	426, 445
Example of Panama Canal	393
Example of the Post Office department	393
Failure of government ownership	403-04
Federal incorporation	404-05, 411, 432
Government ownership undesirable	421
Gradual assumption of ownership	391
Improvement and extension	417-18, 423
Knapp plan	392, 406, 438-39
Labor	407, 422
Limitation of regulation	400
Necessity of government ownership	414
Political corruption and influence. .	385, 395, 406, 421, 440, 443
Pooling	412, 430, 432
Profit	398
Railroad districts	392
Railroads fight regulation	399
Rates	387, 396, 411, 417-18, 419-20, 433, 436
Regulation	399, 413, 428, 433, 440-42
Stock manipulation	386, 395, 410, 443
Transportation a public service	398
United States railroad system	383
Wages and rates	396, 427
Would increase operating expenses	424
Government Ownership of railroads	Vol. IV. 257
Affirmative	257, 267, 278, 280
Negative	286, 287
Bibliography	296
Better service under	269, 295
Circuitous routing	270
Comparison of railways in Europe and U. S. .	271, 279, 292
Competition in railroad affairs	265
Cost of government ownership	267-8, 285, 286
Cost of government operation	268, 289
Discrimination in rates under private ownership, .	265, 282, 294
Efficiency of railroad employees	283
Efficiency of service (see Better Service).	
Eight hour day under government ownership	289
European experience	271
—in Switzerland	274

	PAGE
—in Italy	273
—in Prussia	272
Evils of private ownership	259-60, 282
Historical sketch of subject	257-58
Individual initiative	283, 287
Influence on business	261
Interstate commerce commission	294
Issue of debate	259, 281, 285, 287
Loss of life	260, 295
New Zealand railroads	273
Panama canal	276
Panama railway	277
Puts railroads in politics	284, 286, 288
Postal system	275, 290
'Public men against	280-81, 293
Rates	261
—Discriminations in	262-3, 265, 282, 294
—Uniform	289
Reduplication of lines	264
Upkeep and improvement	290-91
versus regulation	293
Would increase employees and expense for labor	289
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS. Vol. VII.	387
Affirmative	389, 403, 411
Negative	416, 425, 434, 437
Bibliography	444
Competition	400, 408
Complication of present system	421
Concentration of capital in railroads	394
Construction under private ownership	393-4
Cost of government ownership of railroads	406
Definition of interstate	411-12, 417, 429, 434-5, 438
Discrimination	431
Division of railroad system	418, 420, 422
Does not give government complete control	426
Efficiency of service	409
Expedient	390-91
Federal charter	441
Financial situation of the railroads	390, 392, 395, 407
Government ownership is economic saving	397, 408
Government would be hampered in operation	430
Impracticable	426
Improvement on railroad and in service	404, 408
In other countries	390-91
Interstate commerce commission	400
Intra-state railroads	426-437, 439

	PAGE
Land monopoly of railroads	398
Manipulation	397
Political danger	402
Private ownership has failed	391
Profit	396-7
Private ownership offers no hope for future	395
Rates	393, 396, 398-99, 414
Reason for taking interstate roads	403-4, 412
Regulation	395, 400, 405, 421-2, 432, 441
Seriously considered	413
Sound in theory	400
Terminals of interstate road	429
Texas situation	428
Unity of railroad system	399, 408, 410, 414, 419, 435
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF THE MERCHANT MARINE Vol. VI.	203
Affirmative	203, 211, 217, 221
Negative	225, 234
Bibliography	242
Admeasurement laws	230
Auxiliaries	208, 228
Benefits of	212
Cost	219, 238
Dangerous to United States	232-33
Demand for	222, 232
Discrimination	220
Evils in shipping	212-13
Expediency of	232
Failure of private capital	204, 214, 229
Foreign competition	241
Government as a commercial executive	216
is public function	206, 235
is public duty	208
Issues involved	203, 219, 225-26
Method of obtaining ships	222, 231, 237
Navigation laws	223, 230, 242
Need of	223, 227, 232
Operation	222, 236
Opposition of ship owners	209-10
Practicable	215, 235
Precedent for	222, 226, 235
Profit or loss	215, 229, 240
Standard of seamen's living	224
Subsidy	205
United States line to Panama	213
War emergency	229
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE....	
	Vol. VI. 3

	PAGE
Affirmative	3, 10, 15, 24, 27, 31
Negative	37, 42, 49, 56, 59, 63
Bibliography	67
Comparison with	
Australia	65
Canada	53
England	9, 53
France	50, 58
Germany	50
Countries having government ownership of telegraph and telephone	18
Delay in government ownership	46
Demand for	34
Efficient personnel in government ownership.....	26-27, 30, 46
Efficiency of government owned systems	44, 45, 49, 53
Efficiency of private service	64
Evils of present system	4, 33, 48
Experience of U. S. in government ownership of telephone	20-2, 54
Extent of system in U. S.	16, 26, 41, 57, 60
Extent, as compared with Europe.....	26, 27, 28, 29, 40, 44, 50
Extension and improvement	9, 11, 25, 30, 31-32, 43
Failure of government ownership of telephone, etc.	50
Financial failure of government ownership of telephone	24, 34, 44
Government's policy service	12, 13, 43
History government ownership of telephone and telegraph	3, 20-21
Issues	4, 37
Labor	63-64
Necessary	5, 38
Public Utility monopoly	11
Physical valuation	8
Per cent. of messages per capita	9
Postal function	10, 14-15, 33
Post office and telephone and telegraph	57, 58, 63
Paternalistic	30
Political influence of	25, 29, 47, 59
Private ownership and continuous policy	43
Private business incentive	42-43
Relationship of telegraph and telephone	16-17
Rates	5-8, 18, 24, 39, 56-57, 61
Affirmative	
Vol. I. 367, 368. Vol. III. 241, 248, 256, 264, 266, 271	
Negative	
Vol. I. 369, 370, 372. Vol. III. 274, 283, 291, 298, 301, 305	

	PAGE
Rates of European countries, comparison with.....	
18-19, 24, 56-57,	61
Rates for press service	8
Rates and service	19, 29, 39
Regulation	28, 55
Watered stock	7, 32, 62
Municipal Government (see Commission Government).	
Parliamentary vs. Presidential Government	
Vol. I. 367. Vol. III.	241
Bibliography	Vol. I. 372. Vol. III. 308
Parliamentary Government	
and issues	Vol. III. 294
and judiciary	Vol. III. 289
and the minority	Vol. III. 265, 293
and principles	Vol. III. 294
and the recall	Vol. III. 259
and suffrage ..	Vol. III. 265, 267
Can be more quickly adjusted to a crisis.....	Vol. I. 371
Checks and balances	
Vol. I. 368. Vol. III.	255, 267, 275, 280, 281
Definition	Vol. I. 369. Vol. III. 241, 242, 274
Distinguished from Presidential	Vol. III. 243, 257, 275
Efficiency of	Vol. III. 256, 260, 283
Elasticity of	Vol. I. 370
Enables the people to fix responsibility	Vol. I. 371
Factional legislation	Vol. III. 288, 301, 304
Fusion and diffusion of elements of government.....	
Vol. III. 257, 268, 272, 286, 287, 291, 292	
Harmony of action	Vol. III. 260
Hasty legislation	Vol. III. 286, 302, 303
Ministry system	Vol. III. 245, 246, 257
More efficient	Vol. I. 372
Political parties and the ministry	
Vol. III. 245-6, 258-9, 266, 269, 278, 284, 288, 300	
Responsive to the will of the people	
Vol. III. 246, 249, 253, 268, 270, 296	
Responsibility is fixed	Vol. III. 251
Stability of	Vol. III. 245, 264
Tenure of office	Vol. III. 250, 268, 285
Presidential form	
and compromise	Vol. III. 269
and democracy	Vol. III. 292
Checks and balances	Vol. III. 255, 267, 275, 280, 281
Committee legislation system	Vol. III. 252, 301
Defense of presidential form	Vol. I. 367
Fixed term under	Vol. III. 250, 268, 285

	PAGE
Party system under	Vol. III. 258
Stability of	Vol. III. 277, 279, 299, 305
GUARANTEE OF BANK DEPOSITS	Vol. I. 305
Affirmative	305, 309
Negative	312
Bibliography	321
Guarantee of Bank Deposits	
Advantages of	309
and panics	309, 319
Banks are public service corporations	306
Experience, of New York	316
—of Michigan	317
—of Virginia	317
—of Oklahoma	318
Historical sketch of	305
Increases deposits	310
Oklahoma law, constitutionality of	319
Plan for	311
Socialistic	320
Theory of deposits	307
Theory of guarantee	307
versus good management	314, 315
Wild cat banking	311
Wrong in principle	313
IMMIGRATION	Vol. I. 165
as a labor factor	Vol. III. 112, 141, 161, 193, 235
Affirmative	Vol. I. 165, 170, 174
Negative	Vol. I. 177, 181, 183
Bibliography	186
Immigration. Vol. I.	
Congregate in slums	171, 180
Demand for labor	177, 178
Depresses wages	170
Distribution of	171
Educational test	167, 169, 173, 178-9, 181
—Advocates of	176
—Plan for	174
Illiteracy	178-9
Inspection plan	184
Physical test	185
Report, Labor commission	182-3
—Senate commission	176
Restriction, history of	165, 166
—need of	166, 168, 184
—political reason for	167

	PAGE
—social and economic need of	168
Undesirables	172, 180
IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTION OF BY LITERACY TEST. Vol. V....	155
Affirmative	155, 163, 172, 181
Negative	186, 193, 205, 212
Bibliography	216
Ability to speak English	168, 195
Assimilability	162, 165, 171, 182, 194, 214
Basis for	158
California immigration	157
Congestion in cities	196, 197
Consular inspection and four per cent. stock plan	163, 178-79, 181, 187, 211, 212-15
Danger of literacy	202
Deportation	176
Discrimination of	192
Distribution of immigrants	200
Education of immigrants in old country	173, 205, 206
Efficient plan	160
Evasion of	178
Historical sketch of	155
Industrial stratification	166
Inexpensive plan	177
Immigration commission	156, 186
Justice of	172, 191, 207-208
Naturalization question	168
Need for farm labor	164
New and old immigration	190, 195, 199, 203
Number it would exclude	161
Padrone system	170
Permanent exclusion	175
Permanency of immigration	201-2, 204, 211
Practicability of	177
Public opinion favors it	158-9
Qualitative restriction	162, 165, 213
Quantitative restriction	160, 163, 189, 208-10, 212
Qualifications for literacy test	157-8
Recommended by Immigration Commission....	156, 178, 186
Southern and Eastern Europe	161, 166
Statistics on European education systems.....	173
Statistics on literacy test and four per cent. stock plans.	190
Unskilled labor	208
Unintelligence	209
Wages by nationality	167, 194, 213
INCOME TAX	Vol. I. 93. Vol. II. 1
Affirmative.. Vol. I. 94. Vol. II. 1, 12, 17, 20, 22, 59, 64,	71
.....	78, 81, 85

	PAGE
Negative	Vol. I. 99. Vol. II. 24, 32, 40, 46, 48, 51, 89, 94
.....	102, 111, 114
Bibliography	Vol. I. 107. Vol. II. 52, 121
As a war tax	Vol. II. 28, 29, 47
Best tax for business	Vol. I. 96, 98, 103
Catches professional leisure class	Vol. I. 97
Civil war tax	Vol. I. 93, 102. Vol. II. 9, 37, 83, 108
Class legislation	Vol. I. 103, 104. Vol. II. 43
Collection of (see Stoppage at Source and Self-assessment)	Vol. II. 34, 35, 75, 85, 117
Constitutionality of	Vol. I. 93, 94, 106. Vol. II. 2
Countries having it	Vol. II. 59, 73
Direct tax	Vol. I. 100. Vol. II. 4, 27, 27, 49
Double taxation	Vol. II. 79
Drives away capital	Vol. I. 103. Vol. II. 73
Emergency measure	Vol. II. 21, 61, 79
Encourages governmental extravagance.	Vol. II. 40, 42, 92
English experience	Vol. II. 77, 98, 100, 112, 116
Evasion of	Vol. I. 100, 101. Vol. II. 67, 71, 84, 85
Financial necessity	Vol. II. 7, 30, 46, 60, 78, 89, 95, 104
Gladstone on	Vol. I. 101
Graduated	Vol. II. 57
—Plan for	Vol. II. 66, 77, 85, 97, 98, 106, 119
Impracticability of	Vol. II. 21, 23, 81, 96, 102, 116
Inquisitorial features of.	Vol. I. 100. Vol. II. 38, 39
Justice of, Vol. 95, 98. Vol. II. 62, 72, 95, 104, 107, 110, 118	
Popularity of	Vol. I. 100
President Taft on	Vol. II. 5
Prussian tax	Vol. II. 119
Self-assessment or personal declaration.	Vol. II. 35, 47, 101
Shifting of burden or incidence.	Vol. II. 120
Stoppage of, at source	Vol. II. 8, 22, 47
Supreme Court decision	Vol. I. 93, 94, 106
Undemocratic	Vol. I. 104, 105, 106. Vol. II. 79
INCREASED ARMY AND NAVY	Vol. VII. 339
Affirmative	341, 348, 355, 362, 365, 368
Negative	371, 378
Aeroplane service	359
America a world power	351
American isolation	342
American military weakness	346, 378, 379
Are army and navy now adequate	356, 363
Army conditions	357, 378, 379
Can not give up military defense	356
Capturing Villa	348
Coast defense	346, 357-58, 366

	PAGE
Control of the Pacific	346, 353
Convergence of national interests	354
Cost of present war	375
Danger of war	342, 349, 368, 372, 375
Defences of Panama Canal	376
Efficiency of army	380
Failure in civilization to protect against war	343-44
Impending invasion	355, 369, 372
Japanese danger	346, 373
Militarism	345
Militia	359
Monroe Doctrine	375
National friendships	344
Naval need	360, 363, 371
Need of preparedness	345
Neutrality requires preparedness	354
Our commerce demands increase and security	351
Peace agreement after war	377
Plans for army of United States	347
Post-bellum prophecy	352-53
Sea not a protection	343
Standing army	346-47, 357
INDEPENDENCE FOR THE PHILIPPINES. Vol. V.	223
Affirmative	223, 228, 238, 247
Negative	249, 257, 264, 272
Bibliography	275
Capital in Islands	227, 268
Commercialism	227
Danger of Island to U. S.	250
Desire of Filipinos	224
Education in Islands	230, 231, 232, 234, 244, 267
English language in Islands	236
Filipinos in the government	231, 262
Filipinos' ability to govern	240
Filipinos lack initiative	251
Filipinos not ready for	228
Finances of Islands	238-39, 266, 270
Fraud in elections	263
Freedom our governmental principle	225
Homogeneity of Filipinos	229, 246
Improvements in Islands	230, 262
Incapable of self-government	246, 247, 253, 258-269
Industrial training in Islands	232
Japan and Islands	242
Literacy in Islands	235, 248, 254, 265, 272
Methods of granting	241

	PAGE
Middle class in Islands	245, 260
Morality in Islands	233, 234
Need of railroads in	268
Neutrality treaty	241-42, 265
Politics in the Islands	259
Public works in Islands	230, 231, 262
Religion in the Islands	230
Sanitation in the Islands	233
Spanish rule of Philippines	234
Taxation in the Islands	267
U. S. intention concerning	223
Voting population in Islands	254
When shall U. S. grant	225
INITIATIVE	Vol. III. 25, 31
INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM	
Vol. I. 67. Vol. II. 283. Vol. III. 12, 297	
Affirmative	Vol. I. 67, 70, 75. Vol. II. 283, 288, 292
Negative	Vol. I. 78, 81, 85. Vol. II. 296, 302, 307
Bibliography	Vol. I. 89. Vol. II. 313
Initiative and Referendum	
Amendment in considering legislation not provided. Vol. I.	88
and bribery	Vol. II. 289, 298
and the constitution	Vol. II. 301, 307
and the courts	Vol. II. 310
and the legislature	Vol. II. 290, 297
and popular will	Vol. II. 291, 305
and the short ballot	Vol. II. 299
Conditions do not demand it	Vol. I. 80
Conflicting interests demand supplement to legislative	
system	Vol. I. 71
Dangerous to the equilibrium of the three departments of	
government	Vol. I. 85
Definition	Vol. I. 67, 79. Vol. II. 283
Democracy of	Vol. I. 70. Vol. II. 284, 289
Destructive of representative government.....	Vol. II. 311
Diffuses responsibility	Vol. I. 83
Does not meet needs	Vol. I. 81, 82
Education in government	Vol. I. 76
Emergency laws under	Vol. I. 73, 84
Encourages class legislation	Vol. I. 87
Multiplicity of careless legislation under	Vol. I. 75
Obliterates distinction between constitutional and statute	
law	Vol. I. 86
Optional referendum	Vol. I. 72
Oregon experience	Vol. I. 77, 81. Vol. II. 293
Plan for	Vol. I. 72, 75

	PAGE
Public opinion ignored in present system	Vol. I. 71, 82
Reasons for in New York	Vol. II. 293
Reasons against in New York	Vol. II. 297, 305
Simplifies elective system	Vol. I. 77
Too radical	Vol. II. 298
Weakens legislature	Vol. I. 82
Weakness in the representative system	Vol. I. 69, 71
INJUNCTION AND FEDERAL COURTS—LABOR DISPUTES...	Vol. I. 129
Affirmative	129, 130, 131
Negative	132, 134, 135
Bibliography	137
Injunction	
Abuse of	133
Accelerates justice	131-2
Boycott	129, 133, 134
Bucks Stove case	132
Chief Justice Shepherd on	135
Danger of	136
Primary boycott and strike	134
Roosevelt on	133
Taft on	134
Usurpation of power under	135-6
Writ of	130
INJUNCTIONS IN LABOR DISPUTES	Vol. V. 333
Affirmative	333, 340, 346, 352, 356, 359
Negative	363, 370, 376, 382, 384
Bibliography	392
Abuse of	337, 341, 347, 357, 359, 374, 377, 378, 385, 388
and industrial struggle	345
Arbitration	376
Blacklist and lockout	350, 368-69, 372, 383
Boycott and	359-60
Bucks Stove and Range Co. case	364
Cause of	364-5
Courts of equity and courts of law	335, 355, 371
Dayton case—United Mine Workers	342
Debs case	338
Definitions	334
Delay of mails	348, 356, 365, 370, 380
Discretion of judges	378, 385
Enjoying strikes	341
Erdman Act	348
Freedom of the press	366, 371
Historical sketch	333
Interstate commerce and	348, 356, 367, 380
Jenkins case and the strike	341

	PAGE
Judicial interpretation	337, 386
Labor and	368
Limitation of, would work	347
Limitation of, and capital	379
Non-union man and	357, 379
Number of	252, 373
Picketing and	386
Property vs. human right	349, 360, 373
Simplification of court procedure	336
Society and	361, 365-368, 371, 380
Strike breaking and	342-344
Summary of affirmative	361-62
Summary of negative	390
Swiftness of application	338
INSURANCE, INDUSTRIAL	Vol. IV. 301
Accident insurance	Vol. IV. 305
Affirmative	305, 313, 321, 328, 332 335
Negative	338, 346, 353, 362, 365, 369
Bibliography	373
Arbitration	309, 314
Comparison of U. S. and German accident insurance laws	312, 318, 339, 346
Compensation statistics	323, 333, 359
Compulsory insurance	309, 315, 324, 329, 332, 336, 355-57, 366
Cost of accident insurance	303
Countries having compulsory insurance	317, 366
Drain on industry	358
Efficiency of workmen	311-12, 349, 363
Employers liability laws	306
Fails to bring about friendly relations	342
Fixed scale of compensation	308, 313
Frees employee from anxiety	311-12
French experience	327
German accident insurance law	306
—Principles of	307
How German act works	310, 330, 341
Individual and the trade	325
Is desirable	322, 326, 355
Justice of accident insurance	325
Liability litigation	306, 314, 344
Majority of insurance borne by employers	308, 314, 325
Mutual associations	307, 309, 317, 324, 350, 354, 357, 367, 370
Mutual vs. old line insurance	319, 364
Old age insurance	348-49
Optional insurance	333, 335-36, 360, 365
Pauperism under	342, 349

	PAGE
Prevention of accidents under	311-12, 327, 343
Railroad accidents	305
Simulation under	331, 344
Statistics of German act	311, 326, 363
Uniformity	316
Wage statistics	322-23
Wisconsin law	335
OLD AGE INSURANCE	Vol. IV. 348-49 377
Affirmative	379, 387
Negative	395, 402
Bibliography	411
and child labor	386
Comparison of present plan and old age insurance	383, 397
Complex in administration	399, 406
Compulsion of	384, 391
Conditions in U. S. against	397-99
English experience with	390, 392-3
European experience	398
French experience with	373
German experience with	392, 403-4
Government pension plan	389
Old age poverty	380, 385, 387, 402, 405
Pension by private corporation plan	388
Political danger of	410
Poverty and pauperism under	396, 403
Present system of charity	381
Socialism under	409
Voluntary insurance	390
Working of old age insurance	381
INTERSTATE COMMERCE CORPORATIONS, FEDERAL CHAPTER FOR (see also under Corporations)	Vol. I. 39
Affirmative	39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46
Negative	47, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54
Bibliography	55
Federal Charter	
and taxation	52
Centralization of power under	43, 47, 48
Constitutionality of	46, 52
Diversity of laws	41
Double control	42, 43
Federal and state friction	42
Monopoly	49
Overcapitalization	49
Present system fails	40
—Evils of	40, 41, 42, 43
Publicity, effect of	49, 50

	PAGE
Radical departure	47
Recapitalization, difficulties of	47
State incorporation	40
State rights	46, 52, 53
JUDGES (see Appointment and Recall)	
.....Vol. I. 345. Vol. III. 75, 289	
JUDICIAL DECISIONS; RECALL OF. (See under Recall.)	
JURY DECISION BY THREE FOURTHS OF THE MEMBERS. Vol. III. 313	
Affirmative	313, 314, 315
Negative	317, 323, 330
Bibliography	337
Contrast between American and English systems....	326-7-8
Decision in civil suits	318
Delay in procedure of court	327, 332
Effect of skilled counsel on jury	334
Hung juries	320
Impaneling the jury, method of	325-6, 332
Needless appeals	328
Police system	324
Proficiency of jurymen	333
Unanimity and crime	322, 332
Unanimity safer	321
LABOR UNION	Vol. I. 201. Vol. III. 103
Are labor unions beneficial	Vol. I. 201
Affirmative	201, 205, 208
Negative	211, 213, 215
Bibliography	219
Advantages of capital	202
Bargaining power of	202-3
Boycott	215
Causes false equality in labor	212
Causes inferior product	216
Closed shop	214
Coercion	213
Definition	201
Eight hour day	204, 205, 207, 216
Engenders class spirit	212
Historical sketch of labor	202
Incorporation of labor unions	213
Labor union principles	Vol. III. 188
Lawlessness	217
Limitation of apprentices	212
Limitation of products	216
Opposed to machinery	213

	PAGE
Picketing	215
Places laborers on the same plane	212
Report of U. S. Industrial Commission.....	206, 207, 210
Restriction of skilled workmen	213
Social significance of	208, 209, 217
Strikes	214, 215
—sympathetic	215
Violence	215
Wages	203, 204, 205, 206, 217, 218, 219
Workingmen's insurance	207, 208
Closed shop vs. open shop.....	Vol. I. 261. Vol. III. 185
Affirmative	Vol. I. 261, 268, 274, 282, 285, 288.
.....	Vol. III. 187, 193, 200
Negative	Vol. I. 264, 270, 276, 280, 283, 286.
.....	Vol. III. 206, 213, 219
Bibliography	Vol. I. 290. Vol. III. 226
Closed shop	
and compulsory membership....	Vol. I. 278. Vol. III. 215-16
and efficiency	Vol. III. 196, 202
and industrial peace	Vol. III. 204
and standard of living	Vol. I. 270. Vol. III. 189-90
and unemployment	Vol. III. 214-15
Apprentices, limitation of	Vol. I. 283. Vol. III. 212
Benefit to consumers	Vol. III. 205
Benefit to employer....	Vol. I. 275. Vol. III. 201, 202, 203-4
Benefit to the workingman	Vol. III. 198
Coal strike commission award	Vol. I. 264
Collective bargaining.....	Vol. I. 272. Vol. III. 201, 202-3-4
Conditions contrasted in open and closed shops..	Vol. III. 203
Definition	Vol. III. 187
Dictation to employer	Vol. I. 265, 273. Vol. III. 222
Employers' associations	Vol. I. 287. Vol. III. 191
Evils of	Vol. I. 265-6, 281
Exclusion	Vol. I. 278, 285. Vol. III. 211
Immigrant labor	Vol. III. 193
Individual right of contract...Vol. I. 282. Vol. III. 196, 218	
Injustice to the public	Vol. III. 224
Is fair	Vol. III. 201
Legality of	Vol. I. 274, 282. Vol. III. 221
Membership of union, restriction of..	Vol. I. 264, 268, 270, 274
.....	279. Vol. III. 212, 217
Monopoly of labor....	Vol. I. 279. Vol. II. 250. Vol. III. 208
Necessity of.....	Vol. I. 262, 272, 275. Vol. III. 188, 190
Non-union man, competition of	Vol. I. 271
—his wages	Vol. III. 192
—per cent. foreign	Vol. III. 195

	PAGE
Open union and closed shop	Vol. III. 216-7
Output, restriction of	Vol. I. 267, 276-7. Vol. III. 210
Percentage of union labor unskilled.....	Vol. III. 94
Violence under.. Vol. I. 261, 266-7, 280, 284. Vol. III. 209-10	
Wages under	Vol. I. 269, 274, 275
LABOR UNION EXEMPTION FROM SHERMAN LAW	Vol. VII 45
Affirmative	47, 57, 67, 71
Negative	77, 88, 100
Bibliography	106
Application of Sherman Law	62
Buck Stove and Range Co. case	61, 80
Capital and labor economic sources of production	84
Cincinnati Ice workers strike	97
Class legislation	51, 67, 85
Clayton amendment	45, 58, 67
—a political measure	79
Danbury Hatters case	64 92, 95
Discrimination against labor	61-62
Injunctions in labor disputes	58, 60
Injury to public	64, 74
Injustices to labor	60
Injustice to unorganized labor	83
Labor's competition with capital	63
Labor as a commodity	54, 56, 79
Labor influence on production and distribution of com- modity	69
Labor will take advantage of exemption. .64, 66, 82, 92-93,	99
Laws governing capital and labor should be different....	52-56, 68 87
Necessity of labor unions	48, 71
Operation of exemption in England	70, 100
Principle of exemption	51, 86
Rights of labor	53, 80, 105
Sherman law and labor organization	81, 84, 104
Should labor unions be classed with trusts?.. 50, 60, 69, 84-85	
Sympathetic strike	59, 73, 81, 95
Union a party to combination in restraint of trade.....	55-56, 89-91, 92
What labor gets in the exemption	78
MINIMUM WAGE	Vol. III. 83. Vol. VI. 71 (See below).
Affirmative	83, 93, 107, 116, 124, 135, 138, 142
Negative	147, 156, 164, 174, 177, 179
Bibliography	183
Minimum wage and child labor	86

	PAGE
and economy of production	120-1
and equality of opportunity	513
and morality	111-12, 114, 143
and price of product	101, 154, 176
and unemployed	153
Australian plan of	91, 120, 142, 164
Benefits to the employer	99
Charts on	132
Constitutionality of	145, 168, 171, 180
Definition	83, 108
Driving out industries	155, 160
Economic and labor authorities favoring	92-3
Elasticity of	140, 157
English plan	128, 148, 158
Government prerogative	102, 122, 166
Immigration under	141, 145, 166
Intimidates capital	155, 160
Law of supply and demand	90
Mobility of labor	143
Necessity of	136, 150
Opinions on	128, 131, 152, 159, 169, 170-1, 178
Parasitism	109
Plans of	94-5, 119, 126
Practicability of	137
Protects laborer	92
States proposing laws	96
Sweat shop	84, 148
—and disease	86, 100
—and organized labor	89
—and present law	90, 91
—and wages	85, 88, 89, 97
Wage boards	95, 97, 120, 126
Wages and standard of living	97, 125, 135, 150, 156, 159, 174-5
Wage, the living	108, 117, 118, 125
—Maximum and minimum	98, 128, 142, 153
—Theory of	115, 117, 163
MINIMUM WAGE	Vol. VI. 71
Affirmative	73, 82, 90
Negative	99, 107, 117, 129, 133, 137, 143, 147, 149
Bibliography	153
Apprentices	92
Basis of wages	77, 80, 108, 111
Better remedy	123
Child labor	88, 147
Collective bargaining	78, 142
Comparative conditions in Australia and the U. S.	95, 96

	PAGE
Definition	73, 74
Degeneracy	88-89, 143
Dependent workers	88
Diminishing returns	138
Drastic	101
Effect on migration to cities	113
Employers and	84, 140-41
Enforcing minimum wage	94, 144
Factory legislation	75
Freedom of contract	116
History of minimum wage	75, 109, 131
Human subsidy	85, 157
Increases immigration	114, 134, 147
Inelastic	105, 112
Labor is opposed	106
Living wage	79, 80, 112, 130, 150
Living wage, service and efficiency	84, 93, 114, 130, 133
Minimum will become maximum	92, 115
Normal worker	183
Parasitism	85, 87
Paternalistic	117, 131, 143
Poverty	104
Production of labor	135
Public and	86
Skilled labor	82
Social problems	88
Strikes and	115
Subnormal labor	88, 91
Sweated industry	79
Unskilled labor	84, 103
Wages	108
Wages in the U. S.	80, 100
Wages and efficiency	83, 133, 134, 135
Would throw laborers out of employment	110, 130, 131, 138, 146
MONROE DOCTRINE, ABANDONMENT OF. Vol. V.	3
Affirmative	3, 10, 16, 20
Negative	22, 32, 41, 46
Bibliography	50
A. B. C. powers and	9, 42-3
Advantages of	27
Altruistic	19
Attitude of public	26, 36, 37
Bingham's book on	23
Caribbean powers and	13
Cause of ill will toward U. S.	44

- Changes in 5, 6, 7, 11, 46-47
 Colombia and 14
 Conditions in 1823 4, 16
 Danger to the U. S. 33
 Debt collecting 6, 48-49
 Definitions 3, 22, 43, 47
 Drago Doctrine 39, 40
 Embarrassment of in Benton affair 11
 Europe's attitude.... 4, 8, 17, 20, 24, 29, 30, 33, 35, 38, 40, 49
 Holy Alliance and 4, 8
 International law and 17, 26, 33, 47
 Interests of U. S. 15, 24, 27, 36
 Latin America and 43-44
 Lodge resolution 6, 8, 48
 Magdalena Bay 7
 Mexico and 7, 48
 Need of 17, 22
 Nicaragua and 6, 34, 35
 No demand for abandonment 23, 26
 Panama Canal and 28, 30, 33
 Peace and 38, 39
 Practicability of abandonment 29, 31
 Present conditions and 5
 Roosevelt on 24
 Santo Domingo and 5, 48
 South America and..... 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 25, 28, 42, 45, 47
 Taft on 24
 Venezuela and 5, 12, 30, 40, 47, 48
- NATIONAL BANKS Vol. III. 342, 344, 354, 357, 371, 375, 380
 NAVY, AN INCREASED Vol. I. 293
 Affirmative 293, 294, 295
 Negative 295, 296
 Bibliography 297
 Definition 293
 Money needed for other things 297
 Necessity of 294-5
 Sufficient now 295-6
 Weakness of the navy 294
 Will make for peace 295
- NEW YORK Vol. II. 325, 353, 377
 NOMINATIONS (see Direct Primary).
- OPEN DOOR POLICY IN THE ORIENT Vol. VII. 209
 Affirmative 211, 216, 221, 227, 230, 233
 Negative 236, 242, 248, 254, 257, 261
 Bibliography 265

	PAGE
Attitude of England	213
Attitude of nations of Europe	253
Attitude toward China	219
China does not need our interference	246-47
China does not want our interference	245
Chinese exclusion	259-60
Control of the Pacific	225
Historical sketch	211-12
Insistence to the point of war	232
Insistence would increase our burden	243
Involves change in our policy	247
Japan and Korea	223, 234, 263
Japan's attitude toward the United States	224
Japan's attitude toward China	215, 220, 221, 233, 256
Japanizing of China	257-58
Japanese demands	222-23, 229, 263
Japan does not need to violate Hay agreement	240-41, 261
Japanese Monroe doctrine	249
Less danger of war to insist on Open Door now	226
Meaning of Open Door policy 212-13, 227, 238-39, 254-55, 264	
Our commerce does not justify interference	228, 241, 251
Our influence in China not commercial	244-45
Our past action in maintaining the Open Door....	217-218, 231
Our policy altruistic	216-17, 219, 228
Our treaty obligations to China.....	217-18, 231, 243, 258
Pacific Policy of the United States	250
Philippines and our geographical connection	220
Situation in the Orient	215, 218
Terms of Hay agreement	212, 237
United States has moral principle to uphold	214
Unsound Military policy for U. S. to interfere in Orient	
.....	250, 252
OREGON	Vol. II. 293, 311, 334
PANICS	Vol. I. 4, 18, 21, 33, 309, 310, 484, 492-3. Vol. II. 193
.....	Vol. III. 349, 353, 377
PARLIAMENTARY VS. PRESIDENTIAL (see Government).	
PHILIPPINES, INDEPENDENCE OF (see under Independence.)	
POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS	Vol. I. 377
Affirmative	377, 379
Negative	381, 383, 384
Bibliography	386
Cost of campaign	383
Deadlocks	378, 380, 382
Direct election conservative	379
Direct election efficient	380

	PAGE
Direct primary as substitute	380
Evils of legislative choice	378, 381
Legislative election has failed	378
Remedy for present evils	385
Would change the character of the Senate	384
Would destroy checks and balances	384
Would increase corruption	383
POSTAL SAVINGS BANK	Vol. I. 481
Affirmative	481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486
Negative	487, 488, 490, 491, 492, 494
Bibliography	495
and panics	484, 492 493
Centralizes investment power	489
Competition with present banks	483, 488
Encourages small depositors	482
Government could not invest funds	490
Government funds (including savings bank) not liable to attachment	489
Increases thrift	482, 491
Necessity for	481, 487
Will stop hoarding	482, 488
Would benefit only Wall Street	491, 492, 493
PRIMARIES (see Direct Primaries).	
PROTECTIVE TARIFF (see Tariff).	
PROPERTY TAX (see Tax).	
RAILROADS (see under Government Ownership).	
RAILROAD DISCRIMINATION IN RATES	Vol. I. 49
RAILROADS, FEDERAL CONTROL OF	Vol. I. 147
Affirmative	147, 148
Negative	151, 155
Bibliography	159
Capitalization of railroads	148, 149, 153
Centralization of power	154
Federal license system	156
License vs. charter	157
Insures just taxation	148, 151
Interstate commerce commission	155
National problem	147, 150
Necessary for rate regulation	148, 154
Pooling	150, 153
Rebates	153
RAW MATERIAL, ADMISSION FREE	Vol. II. 185, 160
Affirmative	185, 196
Negative	207, 216, 227
Bibliography	229

	PAGE
and compensatory duties	201
and conservation	186, 227
and double protection	204
and labor	188, 205
and prices	203, 214, 221
and reciprocity	194
and shifting of import tax	189, 190
Cheapens manufactured products	189, 224
Definition of	185, 217
Increases foreign trade	193
Is an unjust discrimination	222
Means increased tariff on finished product	218, 219
Not a principle of the Democratic party	208
Other countries tax raw material	229
Theory of	187, 197
RECALL OF JUDGES	Vol. II. 366
Affirmative	369, 377, 383
Negative	389, 396, 401
RECALL, THE	
and caprice and popular clamor	385, 399, 403-4
and people and constitutional government	379, 399
and rights of the minority	400
Cannot trust people	380
Corruption of the judiciary	371, 391
Definition of	370, 389
Delay in courts	375, 393
Election under Recall confuses issues—puts enemies on the jury	398
English system	386
Evils of—Elective system	391
—Appeal system	393
—Antiquated procedure	393
—Remedy for	406
Experimental	388
Experience of California	387
Experience of Kentucky	404-5
Experience of Oregon	387, 394, 405
Forces judge into politics	402
History of	369
Independence of judges	397, 398, 403
Inefficient judiciary under	402
Inequality in justice	371, 373
Interpretation of the question	369-70, 390
Judicial legislation	374
Judicial oligarchy	374
Justice of the Recall	377, 396

	PAGE
Just to the people	379, 399
Just to the judge	377-78, 396, 397
Makes office unattractive	402
Massachusetts system	406
Nature of the Judiciary	396-7
Need of the Recall	371
Negative fallacies	377
Potential value of	385
Power in the hands of corrupt interests	393
Practicability of	383, 391
Protects the judge	378, 397-9
Rich and poor in litigation	371, 373
Rule of majority	380, 385, 399, 403
Sacredness of the judiciary	381, 396-7
Successful in practice	386, 394
Swiss system	387
Unfair trial for judge	397-8
Unsafe	402
Usurpation of courts	374, 384
Vindicates judge	378, 397
Would be overworked	382, 385
Would remedy evils	383, 391
RECALL JUDICIAL DECISIONS	Vol. IV. 61
Affirmative	61, 66, 71, 93, 102, 114
Negative	76, 81, 86, 117, 129
Bibliography	141
and bad legislation	136
and constitutional amendment	72, 82, 116, 129, 133
—examples against constitutional amendment.....	72
and federal supreme court decisions	79, 87, 88
and method of submitting question of recall....	104-5, 114, 126
and public attitude and capability	82, 83, 103-5, 114-15, 121, 125, 127, 134
and social justice	67, 68
Attitude of courts	63
Check upon judiciary	94, 108
Checks and balances	135
Clark, Chief Justice Walter, on	71
Correct in principle	108
"due process of law" clause	61, 65
Expense of	79, 80, 101, 124
How it works	69, 78-9 85, 119, 134
Incorrect in principle	127, 129, 130, 131
Independence of judiciary	75, 98, 110, 131
Individual vs. Society	61-62, 111
Is class legislation	118

	PAGE
Judicial legislation	69-70, 95
Lewis, Wm. Draper, on	70
Legal decisions referred to	
Adair vs. People, Ill.	96
Bake shop case	84, 98
Cases where recall would work	115
Dred Scott Decision	100, 110
Income tax case	102, 109
Ives vs. S. Buffalo Ry. Co.	72, 87, 99, 119, 138
Jacobs Tenement house case	85, 100
New York street car case	96
Oglesby case, Mo.	98
People vs. Lochner (see Bake shop case).	
Richie vs. Wayman, 244 Ill. 509	64
Richie vs. People, 155 Ill. 98	64
Sarah Kniseley's arm	112
Western Union Telegraph case, Kans.	102
Necessity of	63, 94, 95, 97, 137-38
—Examples showing necessity	63, 64, 68, 96, 97, 98
Period of deliberation	74
Police power	61, 62, 66, 112
Practicability	100, 125
People do not want it	134
Roosevelt, Theodore, on	93
Substitute for	87
Would scatter responsibility	130
RECALL OF OFFICIALS	Vol. III. 12, 259
REGULATION OF TRUSTS (see also Corporations) ...	Vol. IV. 151
Affirmative	151, 160, 165
Negative	171, 177, 182
Bibliography	187
Competition	153-4-5, 161, 175
Consumer and regulation	159, 169
Failure of dissolution	163, 166, 169
Federal incorporation	169
Historical sketch—Sherman law	151-2
Interstate commerce commission	167, 179, 182
Injunction under Sherman law	183
Legal Decisions referred to	
Addison Pipe and Steel Co. case	179, 180
Danbury Hatters' case	178
Northern Securities case	163, 180
Other cases	180
Tobacco case	163, 180
Trans-Missouri Traffic case	163, 179
Number of industrial cases	166

- Negative analysis of question 171
 Overcapitalization 169, 173
 Publicity under the Sherman law 185-86
 Principle of Sherman law 152, 153, 154-55, 159, 176
 Small competitor 164
 Standard Oil decision 163
 State dissolution legislation 181
 Sherman law, its clauses 177-78
 Trust commission and present method 167-68
 Trusts, number of 166
 —Carnegie, Andrew, on 173
 —Good and bad trusts 161-62
 —Efficiency of 156, 160-61, 173-74
 —Development of 154-55, 160, 172
 —Legalization of 175
 —Wilson, Woodrow, on 173, 175
 REVENUE, INTERNAL Vol. II. 17, 91, 112
 Stability of Vol. II. 111, 112
 Tariff Vol. II. 15, 18, 30, 62, 63, 71, 72, 86, 92, 113, 225

 SENATORS, POPULAR ELECTION OF (see Popular Election)..
 Vol. III. 252
 SHERMAN ANTI-TRUST LAW (see under Regulation of Trusts)
 SHIP SUBSIDY Vol. I. 405. Vol. VI. 247
 Affirmative 405, 410, 413, 416, 417, 418
 Negative 420, 424, 427
 Bibliography 431
 and free trade and protection 422, 427, 428
 and free material 429
 and revision of navigation laws 430 431
 and ship insurance 430
 by discriminating duties 411, 416, 418
 Definition 405, 406
 English merchant marine 421
 Expense of 418
 Extent of American shipping 405, 406
 Foreign ships carry American trade 405, 406, 407
 —Evil of 407
 Foreign subsidies 410, 421
 France 423
 Germany 423
 Merchant marine a naval resource 407, 415
 Merchant marine furnishes labor a new occupation... 414
 Merchant marine would train sailors for navy 408
 Must protect shipbuilding industry 409
 Navy lacks colliers and transports 408
 Permanent or temporary subsidy 426

	PAGE
Plan for	411, 412
Produces inefficiency	425
Size of marine	406, 408
Subvention, cargo	414, 419
—mail	421, 422
Table—U. S. and Japan	412, 413
Will give independence from foreign shipping combina- tions	415
Will increase our foreign trade	415, 425
IP SUBSIDY	Vol. VI. 247
Affirmative	249, 256, 263, 270, 274, 278
Negative	280, 288, 295, 302, 306, 309
Bibliography	312
American enterprise	269-70
Artificial	301
Balance of trade	285-86
Benefit to the people	267-68
Coastwise ships	273, 275, 290
Commercial need	263-4, 270, 292, 295-6
Congestion in ports	283
Cost of ship building in U. S.	257, 269, 293, 295, 299
Cost of ship subsidy plan	266
Cunard Co. subsidy	298
Danger of war	289, 296
Danger of merchant marine to U. S.	306
Demands of trade	252
Duration of subsidy	268
Economically wrong	297, 301
Emergency	255, 256, 281, 303
Exports of United States	286
Foreign ships carry U. S. trade	294
Foreign ships discriminate against U. S. shippers	267
Government ownership of merchant marine.....	278-79, 309
Guarantee of ship mortgages	260, 278, 310
Indirect subsidy	250
Insurance	283
Interned ships	287
Kills invention and improved service	298-99
Lack of merchant marine	257
Market for surplus output	267
Merchant marine a weakness in war	290-91
Naval auxiliaries	251, 268, 273, 291, 304
Need of merchant marine	250, 263-64, 270, 281, 285
Operation, cost of in U. S.	258, 269, 298
Plan of subsidy	259, 265, 276
Present carrying capacity	257

	PAGE
Rates	281
Rate increase	255, 298
Return cargoes	284
Risks of navigation	282
Scarcity of ships	255
Shipping board	262, 310
Subsidy graft	310
Trade follows the flag	292-93
Undemocratic	297
Unjust in administration	297
Wages in Europe and the U. S.	269, 300
SHORT BALLOT	Vol. II. 299. Vol. III. 7
Affirmative	Vol. II. 319, 326, 332
Negative	Vol. II. 337, 346, 354
Appointive system	332, 341, 348, 350
Bossism	324, 347
Cabinet plan for the state	333
Candidate's acquaintance with	321, 328
Democracy of	338
Education in government, deprives people of	340, 359
Efficiency of, in government	326
Experience of, in Kansas local government	344
—in Kentucky	349
—in New Jersey	355
—in New York	349, 355, 356
—in Pennsylvania	355
—in Philadelphia	349
—in Pittsburg	358
In county	334
In commission government	335
Long ballot, difficulty of	321
Minor offices under	327
Position on ticket	323
Responsibility under	330-1
Technical offices under	329
SINGLE TAX (see Tax on Rental Value of Land)	Vol. VI. 159
Affirmative	161, 167, 173
Negative	179, 185, 191
Bibliography	197
Ability to pay	180
Adequacy	176, 187
Assessing of present tax	174
Based on values created by society	165, 182
Confiscatory	188
Definition	162
Discourages speculation	170

	PAGE
Discriminates	183
Double taxation	168
Encourages industry	163
Exemptions	183, 192
Experience with	177, 193
False economically	185
Inequality of working	185-186
Inelastic	187
Issues	161, 179-180
Justice of	161, 181-182
Land monopoly discouraged	169
Mortgages and assessment	168
Practicability	185-186, 191
Present tax encourages dishonesty	175
Restriction of industry	163, 192
Shifting incidence	171
Social significance of	169-170, 171
Tax reforms	195
Tax collection	174
Tax upon wealth	164
Theory of	163, 180
Unearned increment	166
SIX-YEAR TERM FOR PRESIDENT	Vol. V. 401
Affirmative	401, 410
Negative	417, 425
Bibliography	435
Abuses of four year system	404
Appointees in politics	408-9
Civil service	415, 429
Comparison of plans	424
Dangerous in time of war	434
Deadlocks	423, 433
Efficiency of administration	414
Evils of	418, 432
Evils of present system	404-9, 418
Experience discredits	418, 419
Federal patronage	407-8, 414, 415, 421, 428
First election vs. re-election	413, 420, 423, 430-31
Grant	402-3
Historical sketch	401
Integrity of presidents	413
Issues	425, 426
Party government	402, 412, 421
Power of party machine	402, 408, 412
Preferential primary	416, 429
President forced to campaign for re-election.....	404, 407

President plays politics in present system	404-5
Re-election a check	419
Re-election and immigration question	405
Re-election and public opinion	407, 410-11
Re-election and the trusts	405, 412, 430
Renomination	407, 420
Restricts popular power	427
Roosevelt	403
Third term danger	411
Third term tradition	402-3, 411, 422
Too long and too short	433-434
SOCIALISTIC CONTROL OF PRODUCTION AND EXCHANGE—Vol. VII.	269
Affirmative	271, 279, 287, 298
Negative	304, 311, 318, 327
Bibliography	331
Appropriations	323-24
The Banks	286
Child labor	274
Civil service	314-15
Concentration of wealth	273-4
Consumer and socialism	284-85
Corporation is impersonal	276
Definition	272
Democracy not efficient in business methods	320-21
Dissolution of trusts	299
Economic injustice	274
Evils of Socialism	320
Evils of capitalistic system	273
Example of Germany	293-94
Government lacks responsiveness to need of moment...	321
Incentive to courtesy and service under Socialism	316
Increased cost of living	275, 279-280
Ideal of each system good	304, 306
Individual Initiative	312-13
Individual merit and socialism	315
Inheritance tax	309
Log-rolling for local graft, etc.	322-23
Municipal ownership succeeds	291-92
Opprobrium of "Socialistic"	271-272
Panama Canal socialistic	292
Paternalism	317
Policy of laissez-faire	288-89, 312
Practicability of	290, 300, 328
Present conditions	273, 275, 279-280, 288, 327
Profit in Capitalistic system	276-77
Purchasing power of dollar	275
Reforms	280-81, 288, 307-08

	PAGE
—attitude of capital toward reforms	281
Regulation	298
Tendency toward combination	296
United States steel corporation	283
Wages and socialism	280, 284
Women in industry	274
Would throw men out of work	329-30
SUFFRAGE, EDUCATIONAL	Vol. I. 243
Affirmative	243, 246, 249
Negative	250
Bibliography	258
and compulsory education	253
and illiterate voter	244
Class government	251, 252
Constitutionality	243, 244, 251, 252
Encourages education	244
Enfranchisement of the negro	248
Fallacy of educational test	257
Immigrant affected by	245
Raises standard of citizenship	246
Universal suffrage a political expedient	255
Voting power a right	254
SWISS MILITARY SYSTEM	Vol. VII. 1
Affirmative	3, 9, 14
Negative	18, 23, 29
Bibliography	36
Adequacy of Swiss system	10, 21, 30, 32
Citizen reserve army	3, 10, 24
Comparison of United States and Switzerland	20, 32
Compulsory military service and democracy	5-6, 8, 10, 22
Compulsory military training in schools	32-33
Conscription	22
Cost of military service	13
Cost of Swiss system to the United States	27
Economics of compulsory military service	25
Effect on world peace	27
Immigration and military service	5
Militarism	12, 25-26
Military need of the United States (see Need)	20, 21
Military service and capital and labor	6
Militia	15, 16
Necessity of large army	11, 17
Need of regular army	21, 31
Number of men of military age in the United States	24
Our isolation	28, 29
Our policy	3, 14

- Physical benefit of military service 7
 Preparedness 11, 19, 34
 Swiss plan 3-4, 19
 Term of service necessary 31
 Volunteer system 7-8, 13-14
- TARIFF** (see Raw Material, and Income Tax)
 Vol. I. 111. Vol. II. 149
- Abandonment of protective
 Affirmative Vol. I. 111, 114, 116, 118. Vol. II. 149, 155, 160
 Negative. Vol. I. 119, 120, 121, 122. Vol. II. 165, 171, 176
 Bibliography Vol. I. 123. Vol. II. 181
- Protective tariff
 and business Vol. I. 113, 115, 120, 121
 and cheap labor Vol. I. 117. Vol. II. 173, 191
 and conservation Vol. II. 159, 186, 227
 and free trade Vol. I. 115, 122. Vol. II. 168, 178
 and high prices Vol. I. 117. Vol. II. 171, 197-8
 and reciprocity Vol. II. 177, 194
 Bartering and log-rolling Vol. II. 198
 Benefit to the laborer Vol. II. 162, 173, 175
 —to the farmer Vol. II. 163
 Cause of foreign boycott..... Vol. I. 112, 114. Vol. II. 161
 Drives out capital Vol. II. 192
 English experience Vol. I. 115-6
 Fosters trusts Vol. I. 116, 122. Vol. II. 158, 204
 German experience Vol. I. 115-6. Vol. II. 179
 Has accomplished its purpose..... Vol. I. 112. Vol. II. 151
 Principle of protection Vol. I. 118. Vol. II. 165
 Promotes prosperity Vol. I. 117. Vol. II. 167
 Protected industries sell cheaper abroad
 Vol. I. 118. Vol. II. 155, 191
- Tariff board Vol. II. 176
- TAX**
 Franchise tax, federal conservation Vol. II. 264
 Income tax (see Income) Vol. II. 1, 24, 59, 89
 Inheritance tax Vol. I. 141
 Affirmative 141
 Negative 142
 Bibliography 143
 as revenue reform 142, 143
 as social reform 141, 142
 as state tax 143
 Evils of inheritance 141
 Necessity of 142
- On rental value of land (Single Tax) Vol. II. 127
 Affirmative 127

	PAGE
Negative	128, 134, 140
Condemned by the Rhode Island tax commission.....	141
Definition	129
Inelastic	142
Not properly distributed	134
Is confiscation	139, 140
Taxation without consent of the taxed	143
Unjust to land owners	139, 142, 144
Value of land depends upon the community	135
Would depreciate value of land	137
Would disturb balance of property values	137
Would disturb commercial relations	139
Wrong in principle	133
Property tax	Vol. II. 13, 131
Assessment of	131
On tangible and intangible property	133
TAXATION	Vol. II
Direct	4, 27, 110, 195
Indirect	19
Mill's theory	1
of corporations	14
Personalty and property	13, 131
Principles of	I, 65, 66, 129
Say's theory	65, 66
Shifting the incidence	120, 189, 190, 263
TRUSTS (see under Regulation).	

UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURE FOR STATES. Vol. V.	283
Affirmative	283, 289, 297
Negative	302, 310, 317
Bibliography	323
Advantages of	306
Advisability of	321
Authorities on	300
Bicameral system	284
Business administration	300, 301
Canadian experience	299, 300
Caucus and machinery	292
Changes in bicameral system needed	319
Checks and balances	307, 322
Comparison	320
Committee system	314
Cumbersome (present system)	295
Danger of	308
Deadlock	296
Definition	283

Diversity of representation	307, 322
English experience	303
French experience	303
Hasty legislation	286, 287, 290, 298, 311, 322
Historical sketch bicameral system	302-3
Inefficiency	295
Inherent evils	318
Lack of responsibility	288, 294, 297, 314
Legislature's time limit	311-12
Legislative reference bureau	311, 319
Local legislation	313
Mass of legislation	312
Party system	290
Party machine	291
Plan of	297
Practicability	299
Present conditions	312-14
United States experience	303

WAGES (see Minimum Wage and Labor).

WATER POWER Vol. II. 245

Dictionaries: The Classic Series. *Half morocco.* Especially planned for students and teachers in colleges and high schools. Up to the times in point of contents, authoritative while modern as regards scholarship, instantly accessible in respect to arrangement, in a binding elegant and durable. 8x5½ in.

French-English and Eng.-French, 1122 pp. \$2.00.

German-English and Eng.-German, 1112 pp. \$2.00.

Latin-English and Eng.-Latin, 941 pages. \$2.00.

Greek-English and Eng.-Greek, 1056 pages. \$2.00.

English-Greek Dictionary. \$1.00.

Dictionaries: The Handy Series. Pocket Edition. Scholarship modern and accurate; beautiful print.

Spanish English and Eng.-Spanish, 474 pp. \$1.00.

Italian-English and Eng.-Italian, 428 pp. \$1.00.

New-Testament Lexicon. With a fine presentation of the *Synonyms* of the Greek Testament. \$1.00.

Liddell and Scott's Abridged Greek Lexicon. With new *Appendix of Proper and Geog'l names.* \$1.20.

White's Latin-English Dictionary. \$1.20.

White's English-Latin Dictionary. \$1.20.

White's Lat.-Eng. and Eng.-Lat. Diction. \$2.25.

International Pronouncing French-English and Eng.-French Dictionary. *Half morocco.* The *pronunciation* is indicated by a full re-spelling of each title-word in the system of the *International Phonetic Associ'n*, a widely used means of indicating, simply and accurately, the *pronunciation* of all languages in a *single* (amplified) *Roman alphabet.* \$3.00.

Who's Who in Mythology? A dictionary of mythological characters. Identifies and locates *instantly* every god and goddess, hero and myth that are likely to be broached either in conversation, sermon, song, drama, painting or statuary. 75 cents.

Who's Who in History? A dictionary of classical characters and allusions. Locates the places, identifies the persons, describes the things, which are constantly alluded to in literature, in sermons, in paintings, in sculpture and in conversation. 75 cents

How to Attract and Hold an Audience. Every student in college or school, every lawyer, every teacher, every clergyman, every man or woman occupying an official position, every citizen and every youth who is likely ever to have occasion in committee, or in public, to enlist the interest, to attract and hold the attention of one or more hearers, and *convince* them—every person who ever has to, or is likely to have to “speak” to one or more listeners will find in our new book a clear, concise, *complete* handbook which will enable him to *succeed*! **\$1.00.**

Thorough, concise, methodical, replete with common sense, complete. In his logical method, in the crystal-like lucidity of his style, in his forceful, incisive, penetrating mastery of his subject, the author has at one bound placed himself on a plane with the very ablest teacher-authors of his day.

Fenno's Science and Art of Elocution. *Standard.* Probably the most successful of its kind. **\$1.25.**

The Power of Speech, How to Acquire It. **\$1.25.** A comprehensive system of vocal expression. Thorough and practical instruction in the use of the speaking voice, embracing deep breathing, articulation, modulation, emphasis and delivery; vocal coloring, interpretation of the written word, the conveying of thought by means of vocal expression, and the principles of oratory and dramatic art.

The Psychology of Public Speaking. A scientific treatment of the practical needs of the public speaker. A worth-while book. **\$1.25.**

How to Use the Voice in Reading and Speaking. By Ed. Amherst Ott, head of the School of Oratory, Drake University. Suitable for class work. **\$1.25.**

How to Gesture. E. A. Ott. New *illus.* edit. **\$1.00.**

Constitution of U. S. In English, German and French. *Paper*, 25c.; *cloth*, 50c.

Constitution of U. S., with Index (Thorpe's *Pocket Edition*), 35c.

Brief History of Civilization (Blackmar), **\$1.25.**

The Changing Values of English Speech. **\$1.25.**

The Worth of Words. (Bell). **\$1.25.**

The Religion of Beauty. (Bell). **\$1.25.**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



101 750

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY